

THE REPUBLIC.

Devoted to the Dissemination of Political Information.

VOL. VI.

WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL, 1876.

No. 4.

JENKS' BABY.

Ginx's baby cried so piteously in England that the English, in a moment of maudlin compassion, sent its father to the British Parliament. That baby was the ruin of its parent. It turned his head. He is to-day the butt of the House of Commons, where no progenitorial merit is tolerated unless it "hails" from Windsor Castle—or "reigns" there.

There is another Jenks, who is envious of his namesake's political renown. He is in the House of Representatives. He, too, has been brought to bed of a baby. He calls it a Statement. Appended to it is the "testimony" of the men on whom he relies to prove that, as the Southerners say, he has a "sure-enough baby this time." This Jenks, too, has had his head turned. Turned to the rebels—in wooing mood. Will they kindly consent to make him their tool? That is his high ambition. To secure this favor he is ready to throw suspicions of fraud on honest and loyal men, who are honestly, and in a loyal spirit, doing their duty to the honest and loyal men who were wounded in driving back the rebels whose smiles cravenly he craves.

Leaving the Confederates, who *created* our vast pension list, who sent three hundred and sixty thousand of our soldiers into untimely graves, to do as they please with, to use or to abuse this their willing vassal, it becomes a public duty to arraign him as a bearer of false witness against the faithful servants of the Government which they so earnestly sought to destroy.

Mr. Jenks' statement is No. 93 of the House Miscellaneous Documents. The reader who is in possession of it should carefully

compare it line by line with this review. For the author is a man of such exact, extensive, and explicit misinformation that an exposure, to be effective, should follow every sentence of his essay on "The Transfer of the Pension Bureau to the War Department." Necessarily the answer must be longer than the charges, for his report is a sort of Leibig's Essence of Errors. It is a compact sample of every form of misstatement—by misconception, by direct assertion of what is not correct, and by ingenious indirection and implication.

I. His first misstatement is by the implication that the accounts of the Pension Bureau are not carefully kept. He says:

"\$2,885,189 are claimed to be paid on arrears of pensions granted during the year, of which no separate account is kept."

"*Claimed to be!*" That is, it is probable that this amount is not correct—that the officers of the Bureau misrepresent the sum total, or embezzle it, or so complicate the accounts with others that it is impossible to discover any fraud—if there is fraud. It shows looseness of administration. That is the inference. What are the facts?

The truth is that arrears of pensions are not "separate accounts" by the very nature of them. When a pension is granted it dates back to the period prescribed by law. The first payment to the pensioner includes the total amount that he is entitled to from the date of his pension, precisely as if the payments had been regularly made each quarter, during the whole of the time. The payments of these arrearages, that is to say, are made in the same way, the accounts are kept in the same way, and all the business is

conducted in the same way—by the same officers, with the same forms and with the same vouchers given—as the regular quarterly payments of all pensions. To keep a separate account of arrearages would only involve addition clerical work, while no new security and no further checks would be given, and no practical purpose would be served by it.

II. Mr. Jenks' second point is ingeniously involved, and is a jesuitical example of indirection. He says:

"\$488,580 is paid to the officers and employees of the Bureau proper; \$40,000 to the detection of fraud; \$33,800 to contingencies in the office; \$57,291 to examining surgeons; \$427,257 to fifty-eight disbursing agencies; and \$23,278 for stationery and postage of the agencies, of which \$10,448 is for postage. While by law it is provided that a fee of twenty-five cents on each voucher shall be in full compensation for all services, including postage, for mailing vouchers and checks, the amount of fees paid annually by the Government for those vouchers to the several agents is \$214,523."

This is masterly both in its indirection and misstatements, both in its sins of omission and commission. Let the reader note the effect of these statements in his own mind before reading the reply. A Democratic paper thus translates it:

"This item (of \$10,448) is outrageously large in view of the law which prescribes a fee of 25 cents on each voucher as full compensation for all services, including postages, for making vouchers and checks. But notwithstanding this provision of the law the agents charge postage, and the Government pays them in fees for these vouchers \$214,523 annually."

Now here is the impression left on the mind of any reader not familiar with the facts, that the Government is robbed out of three distinct amounts: 1st, \$10,448 for postage; 2d, of \$23,278 for stationery; and 3d, of \$214,523 for agencies every year. This was obviously the intention of Mr. Jenks in thus presenting the statements.

What is the truth?

The items for stationery and postage, "of which \$10,448 is for postage," are *not* on account of "vouchers and checks" mailed to pensioners, as Mr. Jenks could easily have ascertained, but are exclusively on account of the general correspondence and work of

the agencies outside and independent of the business of "mailing vouchers and checks." The Bureau has the charge of 234,821 pensioners, all of whom, from time to time, have more or less incidental correspondence with the agencies. The agencies also communicate regularly with the Commissioner of Pensions, with the Third Auditor, and with the Second Comptroller. Previous to the repeal of the franking privilege the official correspondence of the pension agents with the Government Departments passed through the mails free of postage. Now such correspondence involves a nominal charge for postage. That is, the Treasury is charged, and the Post Office Department is credited with \$10,448, and this postal account, it will be seen, is nominal rather than real. It costs the Government very little to carry this correspondence, because all the machinery of the post office must run whether there are many letters or none.

The postage of the agencies for mailing vouchers and checks is paid by the agencies—not by the Bureau; but exclusively from the fees allowed by law "for mailing vouchers and checks." Now, it is evident that the impression sought to be created is that the sum of \$214,523 is paid to the pension agents *in excess* of the amount authorized by law. The truth is, that it is \$67,262.20 *less* than the amount authorized by law. It would interest the reader to figure out this result—for no such result was ever before possible in America. No Democratic bureau ever spent less or took less than the law allowed. When salaries are due the Democrats are very loyal. They yield ready and full obedience to every statute that authorizes them to take money from the treasury.

There are 234,821 pensioners. They are paid quarterly. This involves the posting of four times that number of vouchers annually, and an equal number of checks, or 1,878,568 letters. The Revised Statutes (Sec. 4782) authorize the agents to collect, not 25 cents, but 30 cents for each voucher. Multiply 939,284 by 30 and the result is \$281,785.20; while the agencies charge the Government only \$214,523, or \$67,262.20 less than they are legally entitled to demand!

III. Without omitting a single word, the

next succeeding sentences of Mr. Jenks' statement are these:

"These officers of the pension service are 58 in number, who, by law, are entitled to an annual salary of not exceeding \$4,000 each, and by a subsequent enactment 25 cents for each voucher paid by them. Each of these agencies, on an average, costs the Government about \$7,700 annually, while several of the agents disburse less than the average salary. The income of many of these agencies exceeds \$10,000, and quite a number almost reach \$15,000, exclusive of contingencies."

No merchant ever heard of anybody paying a voucher; but Mr. Jenks, perhaps, has a wider knowledge of commercial transactions. But let that pass. Let us look at the separate misstatements of this passage:

"Several of the agencies disburse less than the average salary."

Does the reader observe how ingeniously constructed this sentence is? One would think that whereas the average salary is \$7,700, many of the agents received, at least, \$4,000 for disbursing less than that amount.

This is not only not true, but it is impossible.

All the money for pensions and salaries and allowances are sent to the pension agents, and their accounts are audited by the Treasury Department. They cannot retain amounts they are not entitled to, because they are disbursers and not collectors of public money. Indeed, they are not paid a salary at all; but [*Sec. 4781 Revised Statutes*] "two per centum on all disbursements made by them to pensioners." Here is the section:

"Sec. 4781. Agents for paying pensions shall receive two per centum on all disbursements made by them to pensioners. There shall be allowed, however, over and above such compensation, to every pension agent disbursing fifty thousand dollars annually, not exceeding five hundred dollars a year for clerk-hire, office-rent, and office expenses; to every agent disbursing one hundred thousand dollars annually, not exceeding seven hundred and fifty dollars a year; and for every fifty thousand dollars additional, not exceeding two hundred and fifty dollars a year for like purposes. But in no case shall the aggregate amount of compensation to any one agent, paying both Army and Navy pensions, exceed four thousand dollars a year."

Now, unless the disbursements made by a

pension agent amount to \$200,000 he does not receive \$4,000, but only 2 per cent. on the amount actually disbursed—which for \$50,000 would be one thousand dollars, with \$500 added for clerk-hire, office-rent, and office expenses. If, on the other hand, he disbursed a million of dollars his compensation would be no more than \$4,000, with a small allowance for clerk-hire and other contingencies. If, therefore, the nominal "income" of any pension agent is \$10,000 it represents, not compensation, but the fees allowed by law for preparing and mailing checks and vouchers—which is no more, or but little more, than the cost of postage, additional clerk-hire, and other expenses.

IV. Mr. Jenks, after thus raising a spectre by the old and black art of misstatement, thus, with wizard wisdom and face grave as the skull of Mr. Yorick, deceased, proceeds to explain how the dread phantom may be sent back to its sepulchre.

"By having the pensions paid from the Bureau this whole branch of the service, involving an expense of \$449,541, could be dispensed with without material detriment to the service, which, if we may judge by the past history of the Bureau, might easily be done without any increase of force; as since 1866 the force has been increased from 175 to 420 in 1875, exclusive of the disbursing agents, while the labors done by an inverse ratio has diminished in about the same proportion."

Before following the conjunctive Jenks, (who joins error to error as if afraid that each would fall if left unsupported,) into the discussion of the methods needed to secure exactness, which he opens in the last clause of this sentence, let us examine the preliminary error in this extract, and admit that "this whole branch of the service could be dispensed with, and without any great detriment to it." Why? Because the 58 agents and their clerks, or an equal number of officers, could be stationed in Washington, and the pensions could be transmitted through the Washington post office by money orders. But does not Mr. Jenks understand that there are two fatal, or at least Democratic objections to this system? Their dread names are—Centralization and Benjamin F. Butler! General Butler proposed that method, and it was rejected by Congress.

Observe: all the clerical force in the Pension Bureau in Washington is fully employed. The number of clerks should be doubled. Seventy thousand cases stand adjudicated for want of force to examine them. Further on, Mr. Jenks says:

"Of the 70,000 applicants standing before this tribunal, hundreds, and perhaps thousands are now paupers, maintained at public charge, a standing monument of disgrace to the country which permits the wheels of justice to move so slowly."

It is even so. And the disgrace is one which Mr. Jenks now seeks to perpetuate by reducing the force under the pretext of reform. This charge will be pointed out again, and clinched, after examining a number of Mr. Jenks' other errors.

So, also, are all the pension agents kept busy, and many of them over-worked. Now, if these offices were abolished, their officers would have to come to Washington. It is only a question of locality. The work they do must be done by some one, and somewhere, and whether it shall be at Washington in one building, or in different cities, is simply a consideration of convenience.

But this is the new system of reform that Mr. Jenks has invented; for he recommends it again in his plea for the transfer of the Bureau to the War Department.

V. Before examining his great plan of economy by taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another, it seems to be expedient to expose his additional preliminary misstatements. After the preceding question, not yet fully answered, he says:

"What should be an exact duplicate of the rolls kept at these agencies is now kept in the office of the Pension Bureau and in the office of the Third Auditor of the Treasury, thus involving triplicate labor, with no appreciable advantage to the Government or the pensioners."

This "duplication of the rolls" which so troubles the uninformed mind of Mr. Jenks is but the smallest portion of the necessary work of the financial department of the Pension Bureau. This branch of the service, which Mr. Jenks in his ignorance alike of the laws of his country and of the existing system of checks and balances devised for the security of public accounts, would peremptorily abolish upon the flimsy plea

of "economy," is established under the requirements of section 3622 of the Revised Statutes, as follows:

SECTION 3622. Every officer or agent of the United States who receives public money which he is not authorized to retain as salary, pay, or emoluments, shall render his accounts monthly. Such accounts, with the vouchers necessary to the correct and prompt settlement thereof, shall be sent by mail, or otherwise, to the bureau to which they pertain, within ten days after the expiration of each successive month, and after examination there, shall be passed to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury for settlement. * *

Without this "triplicate labor" there would be no guarantees against fraud or blunders. Does Mr. Jenks desire to remove checks in the hope that his party will succeed in the next election?

VI. Mr. Jenks now moves up his artillery. He says;

"In the Pension office in the year ending June 30, 1866, with a clerical force of 175, about 50,000 original cases, or their equivalent, were adjudicated, being an average of about 284 to each employe. During the year ending June 30, 1875, with a clerical force of about 420, about 12,800 original claims, or their equivalent, were granted—being an average of about 31 to each employe, while 66,000 original and about 7,000 increase claims are awaiting action."

Before noticing Mr. Jenks' statement of the cause of these evils, let the facts be examined, not in the light of partisan disingenuousness, but of the published Pension Bureau records.

In 1866, as he states, there were about 50,000 cases adjudicated. But he forgets to add that the war had then just ended, and that the requirements of the law were few and simple, and that the evidence was easily accessible. These cases were mostly for gunshot wounds, and very few papers were needed—one from the War office showing that the claimant was enrolled in the service; another from the Surgeon General's office showing that he was wounded in the service; and a third from an examining surgeon defining his present disability. It was easy for a clerk to dispose of several such cases every day, especially as nearly all the States had agencies in Washington, which furnished most of the evidence without the aid of the Bureau, or in co-operation with it.

Difficult and doubtful cases were pigeon-holed to await action, when the Bureau should have more time to make careful examinations. As time went on the laws became more exacting in their demands for evidence. The State agencies disappeared, and inadmissible claims multiplied to an extraordinary extent. Rigid examinations became necessary.

In 1875, it is true that only 12,800 original cases were *granted*; but (and here Mr. Jenks shows his disingenuousness) it is *also* true that *ten thousand* cases were *rejected*, each rejected case involving even more examination than an admitted case, and that upwards of 70,000 additional claims were examined, corresponded with, and passed through a greater or less number of the stages that the law requires as leading to a final adjudication.

In 1866 most of the cases consisted of three papers. Now, before a case is settled or *can be* adjudicated without danger of fraud, the evidence often accumulates until it would fill an octavo volume. As time goes by it becomes more and more difficult to obtain trustworthy evidence—for now come up the complicated questions of marriage and divorce, of the legitimacy and identity of children, of the qualifications and honesty of guardians, of the dependence of surviving relatives on the dead soldier's services when he enlisted, as well as the necessity of ascertaining the medical history of the volunteer before and after he entered the army. The laws require these facts to be known before a pension can be granted. In addition to all this new work it should be remembered that every case, from the first to the last, settled or unsettled, is under the charge of the Bureau; that deaths and other events are all the time changing the character of the settled cases, and require, therefore, constant watchfulness and work. From Mr. Jenks' statement it might be inferred that the 50,000 cases adjudicated in 1866 were settled in every way—that they were not adjudicated only, but that they needed no further care, nor superintendence, nor work. The truth is, that every case admitted, whatever its character, is an addition to the work to be done by the Bureau.

It should be remembered, also, that most of the evidence now demanded is wholly outside and independent of any papers to be found in any Department of the Government, and that it must be examined and tested by educated, skillful, and trustworthy men; while the voluminous and constantly increasing correspondence and the routine work of the Bureau take up the entire time of the lower class clerks and copyists, who constitute the numerical majority of the force in the offices.

VII. Mr. Jenks then states that the delays arise from the location of the Bureau and the mode of its administration. They arise from one cause only—the want of an adequate force in the Bureau. He recommends the transfer of the Bureau to the War Department, “the source from which the greater part of the evidence comes.” Now, to begin with, this is not the fact; and, in the second place, wherever the Bureau shall be situated, not a line of copying nor other work can be saved by any transfer of it. The “weight of the evidence on which each claim is or should be granted or rejected” is *not* to be found in the War Department or the Surgeon General's office at all; the questions now to be settled are not wholly military, but *chiefly* legal questions; and even if the Bureau was in the same room in the War Department in which the “rolls” and “records” are kept, the evidence required in *every* case would have to be copied just as much as if it were a thousand miles away, because every case must contain, *not* references to other papers, but the complete record in itself. There is no other plan even *possible*, with a list of over three hundred thousand cases on file. An hour's examination in the Bureau will convince any business man of this fact—at least any competent and honest man of affairs—that when Mr. Jenks asserted that “the duplicate labors now performed by the War Department and the Surgeon General's office can be avoided” in *any* way, he showed an ignorance of the methods absolutely necessary to “insure efficiency, integrity, and intelligence,” which was not only complete and exhaustive, but dishonorable and unworthy as well, because to make it he was led to charge fraud and in-

competency on men with personal and official records which need fear no comparison with his own or with those of any other member of either house of Congress.

VIII. Even the military records that are "mainly relied on" to grant a pension are not on file in the War Department, but those found in the pay-rolls that are kept in the Second Auditor's office in the *Treasury Department*! So that Mr. Jenks does not even know where the evidence exists. Shall the Pension Bureau be removed to the Treasury? His logic demands that course where it is confronted, not with his statements, but with the facts. Nay, more; after having been removed to the War Department because "pensions are military affairs," the Bureau should next be split in two, and one-half sent to the Navy Department because sailors are pensioners; then joined together again, and forwarded with care to the Treasury, because the chief military records are there, and because pensions are also financial affairs; and then again it should be transferred to the Department of Justice, because most of the questions to be decided require judicial examination. To satisfy Mr. Jenks it would be a bureau on wheels!

IX. Having shown that Mr. Jenks is a living encyclopedia of useless misinformation, it remains to prove that his remedies are as puerile as his statements are erroneous. The Department of the Interior was established to incorporate under one executive direction such bureaus as the Government needed which yet did not especially appertain to any of the older Departments. The Pension Bureau has relations with four Departments—War, Navy, Treasury, and Justice; but not one of them covers its whole field of work and inquiry, and not one of them is adapted by its organization to do the service that is needed for a proper discharge of the special duties that the rebellion created toward our disabled soldiers and their orphans and other dependants. If the Pension Bureau was attached to any other Department it would necessarily become an independent bureau, over which the head of the Department would have only a nominal supervision. Each of them is already large

enough or its machinery is too expensive. No one thinks of transferring it to the Department of Justice, and therefore objection need not be urged to such a proposition. Every one knows, who knows what our Government is—we do not say that Mr. Jenks is aware—that the Treasury Department is now too cumbersome, and has too many interests to control, to be available for the pension service.

How is it with the War and Navy Departments? Mr. Jenks states as one having authority and knowledge, that "The duplicate labor performed by the finance division of the Pension Bureau and the pension agencies can be done by the Paymaster's Department of the army with very little addition to its present force."

Having already shown that no duplicate labor can be saved in adjudicating claims by any transfer, it remains to consider whether the army paymasters could do the duties and avoid the expense of pension agencies. Army paymasters are now stationed chiefly at military posts on the frontier—far away, for the most part, from the residences of pensioners, who chiefly live in the States where there are few soldiers and rarely a regular garrison. The transfer of the duties of the pension agencies, therefore, would require the appointment of a large number of additional paymasters, who must perform their duties according to the methods of the War Department, which were not adopted for such a service, and are entirely unfitted for it. They are so little adapted, indeed, for this duty that the War Department itself does not employ them for the payment of bounties, but uses the Post Office Department for that purpose. It can be demonstrated that it would need at least one hundred and fifty new paymasters to fill the duties of the fifty-eight pension agencies, and that each paymaster would cost the country more money than the average compensation of the pension agents. Nor is this all. Paymasters are life appointments, whereas pension agents can be removed at any time.

Mr. Jenks could easily have ascertained these facts, and in all probability knows them. It is not ignorance nor a desire for reform that has urged this change. There is

too much method in the madness to justify a plea of political insanity. The purpose is twofold. By reducing the force of the Pension Bureau the arrearages will increase so much and so fast that the country, it is hoped, will one day be willing, in order to secure justice to its heroic wards, to add to the pension rolls the men who were wounded or otherwise disabled in fighting to destroy the Republic. This is the hidden purpose of this specious plan. Again, by appointing paymasters the Confederate Democracy hope, if they can carry the coming Presidential election, to appoint to life offices a large number of ex-rebel soldiers and their allies in the North. This is the plot. It is in truth an insidious attack on the loyal pension system.

X. Mr. Jenks by elaborately erroneous evidence having convicted the Bureau of inefficiency—to his own satisfaction—ventures, but this time gently, to accuse it of deliberate fraud. "In some instances, at least," he says, "fraud prevails." But when he begins to specify he confines himself to cases of alleged inefficiency, which arise, he says, "from the want of experience in the head and employees of the office consequent upon the Bureau being administered as a political one." He then says that with each Congress new appointments must be made—that the most experienced are discharged to make way for new ones.

Supposing that this allegation were true, —it is not true, but let that pass—does not Mr. Jenks know that the same reason would require him to remove all the Treasury, Department of Justice, Department of State, and Post Office employees to the War Department? For all these Departments—and all the State governments in the United States—are administered as "political" institutions. It happens to be the American system of Government. It may be bad—Austria, Russia, and other European nations may have wiser methods—but the people of this country prefer their own system, and Mr. Jenks will find that he cannot convince them that a permanent Bureaucracy is desirable. The army by its nature is organized on despotic principles, and therefore it is filled with officers having life appointments. But the

people would not tolerate this necessary evil to be made the rule in the civil departments.

Mr. Jenks states that a large number of discharges have been made since the 4th of March last, and, a few lines afterwards, complains that the number of clerks employed is larger than the law allows, and that they were not proportionally of the classes provided by law. Nothing will satisfy him. By increasing the number of lower-class clerks to hasten the adjudication of pending claims, (without thereby increasing the expense.) the Bureau, he asserts, has infringed on the law, and yet he depreciates the large and constantly augmenting number of arrearages! Again: the recent discharges have been mainly made by the present Secretary to improve the force—by the elimination of clerks who were reported to him as incompetent. But the changes are not chiefly attributable to the action of the heads of Bureaus or Departments. It requires business talent of a high order to be an efficient clerk, and many men who come well recommended and are otherwise able, prove incompetent when brought to the test. They must resign or be discharged. Others accept clerkships, and some find that they can command higher salaries in business, and leave the Bureau for that reason.

But how comes it that a Democrat should complain of rotation in office? What party first unfurled that banner? Who was it that declared the axiom that to the victor belongs the spoils? Why, it is a cardinal principle of Confederate Democracy. Who was it that turned out the crippled soldiers in the Capitol?

Mr. Jenks' illustrations of inefficiency are uncommonly ill-chosen. He solemnly declares, as if he had discovered a new outrage, that Mr. Atkinson confessed "with great frankness" that he had no experience whatever in the duties of Commissioner *prior* to his appointment. "Oh, my!" This is a novelty. What experience as a Congressman had Mr. Jenks himself *prior* to his election? What experience has any officer *prior* to his appointment? What experience had Captain Boynton as a swimmer before he went into the water? No man can have ex-

perience in an office before he is put in it. The question is, is he competent? Mr. Atkinson's evidence as brought out by Mr. Jenks shows that he *was* competent and did credit to the President's selection of him. As the one instance of Mr. Atkinson's incompetency Mr. Jenks says that he appointed Governor Furnas, of Nebraska, as a special detective. This is a cowardly mode of attack. It insinuates that Governor Furnas was not competent. Now, the truth is, that the ex-Governor has been one of the most efficient officers that the Bureau has ever commissioned. Mr. Jenks does not dare to deny this fact. The Commissioner, he says, turned off a number of skilled and experienced hands. The truth is, some were discharged for incompetency, and some resigned on account of the reduction of salaries, and that none were "turned off" without cause.

Mr. Jenks makes another general specification:

"The duties a number of others performed were very uncertain and ill-defined; but when they seemed as far as human observation could detect to be doing nothing, they would be found to have been detailed in

the secret service division of the Department."

This is false. This response may seem rude, but it represents the fact.

But Mr. Jenks gloats over the discovery that two clerks were employed for a short time by the Republican Congressional Committee. This offense consists in rendering political service to a party when in Government employment. There is a Scripture which saith "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye," and there is a member of Congress from Pennsylvania by whom it should be studied. He receives \$5,000 a year, payable monthly, for devoting his whole time to the service of the Republic. He goes home after the session is over, and then, like an honest man, does he study daily the questions that demand solution in Congress? No! he attends to his own private business, and renders partisan service for months and months:—but he draws his pay regularly once a month. This honest and consistent patriot is struck with horror on discovering that a \$1,200 clerk gave a part of his time to party service! The name of this saint in Congress is—JENKS!

TREASON ON WHEELS.

BY JAMES REDPATH.

Now that the tumultuous shouts of indignation evoked by Mr. Davis have died away, will you permit me, an old abolitionist, to point out the vital issue which the old chief of the old South presented in his letter—an issue of transcendent national importance that has been entirely overshadowed by the transient personal question that was intertwined with it? I do not care to waste time nor to arouse angers by asking whether Mr. Davis was or was not responsible for the cruelties of the Confederate prisons. That is a question for the courts and for history. The action of our Government announced the verdict of "not proven." As a loyal citizen, I abide by it.

JEFFERSON DAVIS AS A REPRESENTATIVE MAN.

But Mr. Davis in his famous letter showed that he is still entitled to be regarded as the representative of the present ruling power of the South; for in it he reaffirms the doctrine of State Sovereignty, which Wade

Hampton, Ben Hill, Robert Toombs, James B. Gordon, Beverly Tucker, Alexander H. Stephens, and nearly all the other conspicuous Southern politicians have reannounced as their creed since their disabilities have been removed. The offense of Mr. Davis hath this extent—no more.

Mr. Davis wrote:

"The Southern people have forgotten much—have forgiven much of the wrongs they bore. If it be less so among the invaders it is but another example of the rule that the wrong-doer is less able to forgive than he who has suffered causeless wrong."

This language is not insolent, but logical. For, if the theory of State Sovereignty is right then the Nation *was* an invader and the South *was* wronged. Now, this theory rules the Southern States to-day, and it must control our Government if the Democracy succeed in electing the next President of the United States.

It sits personified in the Speaker's chair—

for State Sovereignty has no abler advocate than Mr. Kerr, nor has any disciple of that school a longer or more consistent record.

Mr. Davis, therefore, Mr. Toombs, and (less offensive in his history and his method, but equally emphatic in his utterances,) Mr. R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, each of them distinguished men, have rendered the southern people and the Nation a greater service than they dreamed of rendering, when they came out from behind the thick curtain of silence that had been drawn around them.

THE TRANSCENDENT ISSUE.

For, we must clearly comprehend the Southern creed, not in hostility, but calmly, before a peace that will endure can be made between the Nation and the recently insurrectionary States. And this is the transcendent issue of our age. Economy, the currency, the tariff, swift and trans-continental transit, taxation of ecclesiastical real estate, and even the greater issue of compulsory education—all these are important questions, worthy of the most serious study by every citizen; but they are, each and all of them, dwarfed into Lilliputian disputes in the presence of the Southern problem. These other issues will pass away and be forgotten, and leave little sign; but the future character of the whole country will be influenced for good or evil, as we shall deal to-day with Southern political pretensions.

This issue takes precedence, also, because it involves the question of the power to decide the others.

"THE SOUTH" AS A POLITICAL POWER.

Talk with any honest and intelligent Southern voter, not of the ruling class, and you will find that the term "the South" is used at one time to denote the political organization (so potent once, and now struggling to reassert itself) which was called the Slave Power, and again as indicating the People of the South—for the most part the white people of the South—who were the greatest dupes and victims of that Power. Here lies the error which is the spring of all the misapprehensions that still retard the progress of reconciliation.

"The South," as a compact political power, founded on the theory of State Sovereignty—sometimes euphemized as State rights—

should have neither courtesy nor mercy shown to it. It deserves neither pity nor respect. Its history is one long lurid chronicle of crime. It extended, defended, and "sanctified" slavery with all its wrongs and cruelties, and its rebellion. It forbade free speech, a free press, free schools in every Southern State. It kept four millions of blacks, not in slavery only, but in the most brutish ignorance. It grasped all the rich lands, and drove the poor whites to the sand hills. It kept them also in mental and social degradation. It ostracised and drove out—often murdered, oftener outraged—every Northern man who visited the South, unless he was a sycophant or a convert to their system. *That* "South" cursed both the North and the South. *That* South the Nation crushed. *That* South, now again rearing its hydra head, must be driven back into its cave at any cost. Half a million of men lie mouldering in their graves to-day by reason of the insurrection of this malevolent power. It has had human sacrifices enough.

THE SOUTH AS A PEOPLE.

The Southern People have the sympathy, and respect, and hearty good-will of the Nation. There is no hatred of them. They are entitled to our kindest consideration—but, the Spirit of Gush willing or not willing, no further and no longer than they disclaim the pretensions of the politicians who are trying to re-establish the power that has already drenched their land in blood. Northern men must be treated as well when they chose to live in the Southern States as Southern men are treated when they settle in the North. This is not the fact to-day. Nowhere in the North is the Southern man or woman, whatever may be his or her creed, treated with discourtesy, or socially ostracised. The statement is often made that Northern men are well treated in the South "when they don't interfere in politics." But the American who does not take an active part in politics, when there are vital principles in dispute, is unworthy of his citizenship, and voluntarily degrades himself when he permits any social power to keep him from the exercise of the franchise.

In fighting the evil power that calls itself "the South" we are fighting the battle of

the People of the South, black and white, and rich and poor; for all classes of men there, and all conditions of society, have been cursed by it, and are blighted by it to-day. No rapid or real progress is possible in that regal region of our national domain until it is rescued from the grasp of this political despotism. "Intimidation," which, as Mr. Toombs boasted, keeps the negro from voting, is equally effective in keeping the capitalist from investing.

Bearing in mind the broad distinction between the South as a political power and the Southern people as citizens of the Nation—not a distinction only, but an antagonism as well—let us examine the first great project for translating the creed of "the South" into facts, as presented by the cautious, conservative and scholarly Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, and see how he re-echoes, in more decent and decorous phrase, the sentiments of Hill and Toombs, of Georgia; and in less exceptionable and irritating terms the opinions of Davis and Gordon.

I refer to his letter in favor of

THE TEXAS AND PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Mr. Hunter addresses his letter to Representative Lamar, of Mississippi, who had expressed some interest to know his opinion. He recognizes Lamar "as the man to whom the South seems to be turning its eyes as a leader to aid her with counsel, and protect and prosecute her interests in legislation."

LAMAR'S THEORIES.

Mr. Lamar used to argue, last winter, in conversation with friendly opponents, that while Republicans might be personally honest men, yet their system necessarily bred corruption by its comprehensive schemes of internal national improvement, which were always, more or less, productive of "jobs." Democracy, on the other hand, fettered by its theory of State sovereignty, while it might sometimes or often oppose plans by which the Nation might be benefited, did not afford the opportunities for frauds or peculations on the Government.

This theory has only the facts of our history for half a century—during the whole career of Democracy regnant—to oppose it:

"Just so much, and nothing more."

It will be interesting to note how the rhe-

torical professor will explain it away when he is called on to advocate a scheme—the most stupendous job of the session—which is bottomed on the antagonistic theory. For he is relied on to "put through" the Texas and Pacific railroad job—now, if he can, or if he dare; but after the Presidential election if prudential considerations shall restrain immediate action.

THE COST OF THE JOB.

The New York *Times* has shown that this scheme, sooner or later, in all likelihood, will saddle the Nation with a debt of four hundred millions of dollars, and Mr. Singleton, of Mississippi, has declared that "the South" expects Congress to adopt it.

In view of this magnificent project for proving the sincerity of the Democracy on their favorite and vaunted virtue of economy, too little attention has been paid to the arguments of its advocates, and especially to the masterly plea of Mr. R. M. T. Hunter.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY AS A RELIGION.

Mr. Hunter's letter is an elaborate plea for the prosecution of this scheme by the Federal Government, as a measure by which "the South"—not as an indivisible member of the national body, but as an independent section and an antagonistic entity—may regain its lost political power; and, therefore, it is addressed chiefly to the consideration of the theory of State Sovereignty as it affects this important project, or as it might influence the votes of its votaries. He says that he himself voted against this measure in Congress, but that although he still believes that "the harmony of the country requires the adoption of the old State rights theory," still his general views have been "modified by further experience and the results of the war." He then goes on, in sometimes indistinct but in always intelligible rhetoric, to argue that the Southern members should not let their principles stand in the way of their interests, especially on this measure—which, he says, is "one not only of a large pecuniary interest, of trade and commerce, but of empire also."

Empire—of what? of the Nation?

Hardly of the Nation; because he takes especial pains to reiterate the creed which brought it to civil war. He says:

"I hope I need not say that I mean no reproach to States' rights now, even to the Pharisees of the school, if true and sincere. I have neither the heart nor the right to cast reproach on any such. *I regard the followers of this school as the soldiers of the true Cross, politically speaking*, if I may use the term in this sense without irreverence, which I surely do not mean, and God forbid that I should cast a word of ridicule or condemnation on any, even the least of them."

Thus does the advocate of railway construction reiterate the ideas of national destruction!

Again, he says, and this time shows a cause why the true soldier of the cross should sometimes stoop to conquer:

"The hold of States' rights principles in the South ought not to be weakened, if it be practicable to prevent it, by interposing them unnecessarily to the accomplishment of an object so necessary to restore that section to its just share of power in the Government and its fair share of influence on the public opinion of the country. For upon these two things will depend the safety and prosperity of the South hereafter. To suppose that the contests for power or of interest between the different sections of this Union will not be continued, not by arms, it is true, but by policy and fair appeals to public opinion, is chimerical indeed. Here is a great and fair field for enterprise which it had been well if it had been more wrought heretofore. To maintain and nurse the political power and influence of the South in the common Government is a fair subject of aspiration for her representatives."

Still, always, everywhere—"the South," never the national welfare is considered. Still, "the South," as a "section," is to "maintain and nurse" a separate political power. Why, pray, should Virginia have more interest in Texas than in Minnesota? As a loyal State of the Union she has no more interest in Texas; but as a talon of the political "South" her greater interest in Texas is evident enough.

PLEA FOR THE SOUTHERN OLIGARCHY.

In speaking of "the South" these men never mean the Southern People—but only the oligarchy which brought on the rebellion and all its woes. Mr. Hunter makes this fact clear in another passage:

"The Texas Pacific road presents an instance in which by its completion the South will be vastly strengthened in capital and resources to develop its people, their industry and enterprise, and also increase in political

power, not only in influence, but in voting power to protect its people and their rights through the action of the common Government. Does she not need this protection and all this assistance for her material development? Is anybody caring for her now? Has she influence or power enough in the Government to enforce a demand for the supply of her very necessities?"

What rights of *all* the people of any State does the Federal Government invade? It has not even done its duty in protecting the 60,000 Georgia voters whom "the South," as Mr. Hunter defines the oligarchy, intimidated and disfranchised at the last election. It has not prevented the violence and terrorism that prevailed in Mississippi, and resulted in the election of a Democratic delegation from that State. He goes on:

"Would that be the case if Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and the whole of the rich country along the line were settled, and teeming with the resources, agricultural and mineral, which such a population would develop? The levees of the Mississippi, thrown down during the war, which for so long withstood its tide and secured from the waste of its waters vast tracts of fertile country for the use of man, are still down, and there seems to be no sufficient interest felt in the subject by those who control the Government to justify the hope that they will restore them. The moral bulwarks which are the defenses of good order in all civilized society have been prostrated as low in South Carolina and Louisiana, and, indeed, for a time, in all the old slave States, as the restraints upon the Mississippi, and the waste of its worst elements on the face of society, upon which they have been turned, from its surface to its depths, is as wild and as frightful as that of the great Father of Waters himself. Would it not be of infinite value if we had enough political power to secure the correction of these evils? Give us this, and we would right the wrong ourselves. Until this is the case, is it not probable that these or similar evils will continue to occur? What measure has yet been proposed so likely to build up the power which might insure protection as this Texas Pacific railroad, and what State or person is robbed of any power if the General Government should execute it?"

THE SLAVE-PEN VERSUS THE CARPET-BAG.

The "overthrow of the moral bulwarks of society" in South Carolina and Louisiana, singularly enough, has made it impossible in those States for men to traffic in human flesh and blood; and has, somehow, with a

God-like beneficence, enabled the black mother to clasp her babe to her bosom without the fear of the auctioneer's hungry clutch. It has built schools, and taught both the black and white children to understand their duties and their destiny. It has made it possible, in every State, for Americans, of every color, whatever their creed, to utter their opinions with some safety. It has begun to abolish the hell on earth—the reign of merciless and rapacious power—which Hunter and his horde of the barbarians of civilization “nursed and maintained” in all the Southern States.

Do these advocates of State Sovereignty suppose that we have forgotten what the South was under *their* rule? Do they imagine, because we may believe that the negro politicians are sometimes sneak-thieves, that we have forgotten that *they* were red-handed robbers—sparing neither the cabin of the black laborer nor the cradle of his child? And does he believe that we consider it would be of “infinite value” to let the ruffians who slew our sons correct “*these evils*”—the “wrong” of establishing political approximations to just government in the South? Whatever may be the sins of the carpet-bagger they are as white as snow compared with the crimes of the oligarchy who went before them. “The South” had better not compel us to remember its history.

A DISUNION ARGUMENT.

Not satisfied with flaunting the bloody banner of State Sovereignty in our faces again, Mr. Hunter has the superlative folly to suggest, that, in the future, the construction of this Texas Pacific railway may cause a wedlock which shall produce a “vast Southern Empire,” of which it shall be the “umbilical cord.” That is to say, in non-medical language, he wants the Confederate Democrats in Congress to vote for this measure—first, because it will give “the South” greater immediate political power; second, because it will so consolidate “the South” by the creation of new States that the negro and loyal vote may be overwhelmed; and finally, because in the future these new States, backed by the power of the older Rebel States may be strong enough to secede from the American Union!

Here are his words:

“The prospect for the future, which in my opinion promises not only of harmony but of progress in the country, is that of an affiliation of friendly republics, united in the pursuit and protection of common interests and engaged in the development of peculiar interests and ideas, without let or hindrance from the common Government or the intrusion of opinion on the part of other societies, whether friendly or otherwise, to the exclusion of their own. The development of physical and moral ideas is likely to be more extensive, and the pursuit of them will be far more energetic and efficient under the influence of such friendly rivalries than if guided and directed by ideas in which the people who are most concerned do not sympathize.”

This is the general principle—here is the application:

“But there is another point of view in which this question excites what has been called the ‘land-hunger of the Anglo-Saxon,’ by which I do not mean the ‘union of the Roman and Sabine,’ the rape of conquest, but a connection through the bonds of lawful wedlock, brought about through the easy and insensible intercourse of trade and daily social communion. *The construction of this route, it is said, will establish intimate relations of trade and commerce between eight or ten of the northern provinces of Mexico and the people of the American territory through which it will pass. A vast Southern empire may thus arise, holding new relations with the rest of the world, helping to maintain justice and create large common interests amongst the members of the present Union; or perhaps establishing a new point of departure and a new balance of interests on the North American continent.*”

And again:

“But, above all, it must be generally admitted that its effects would serve to redress the present unequal balance of power between the sections to an extent which I do not propose to measure. And all may be done, in my opinion, without an invasion of the rights of the States. For all these reasons I would give a vote, if I had it, to secure the assistance of the General Government to a route from Marshall, in Texas, to San Diego, on the Pacific. I would require the road to ‘prorate’ on fair and equal terms with all that connected with it, and all should be allowed to do so. But if the Federal Government should undertake to carry the road nearer to the Atlantic it should require it to connect with Vicksburg, Memphis, or New Orleans. *The consequence of such a measure I do not pretend to predict or describe. This road might prove to be the umbilical cord through which a nascent empire may derive its nourishment and support from these vast and fruitful wastes, until,*

matured into organized being, it loses the embryo state, and they bear it, like the wild mother of the forest, without a throe or a pang."

HOW TO BAFFLE THE PLOTTERS.

This is the scheme we are called on to adopt, and this the reason why we are expected to aid "the South" to re-establish its power!

The boldness of it recalls the days when the Southern leaders obeyed the summons of President Johnson, and came to Washington from their Provisional Governments. They coolly said then that they would never pay a national debt incurred in suppressing their insurrection; that they would be willing to pay our soldiers pensions if we would put their invalids on our rolls; but as for consenting to enfranchise the colored loyalists they would see us—but their language was not parliamentary, and it is not essential to report it. They declared with emphasis enough, and some to spare, that they would never consent to it.

And now in the Democratic ranks in Congress we no longer hear the language of the Prodigal Son, but boasts of "carrying the South solid," and denunciations of the party that saved the Nation.

It is idle to sneer at these men as "abstractionists" and "theorists." They are *concretists*, of the most practical type, when Colonel Tom Scott is at their head; and when the negro voter is to be overawed or assassinated, or when the Northern man is to be ostracised or whipped, they are realists such as the dark ages never surpassed in stern barbarity.

We must meet the issue that all these blind leaders of the blind have raised, and before quarreling over soft or hard money settle once and forever the issue of allegiance. They always claimed—they claim still—that allegiance is primarily due, not to the Nation, but to the State; that, therefore, it was not the hero of Nashville, General Thomas, of Virginia, who was loyal, but Robert E. Lee, the Virginian; because Thomas did not follow his State, whereas Lee anticipated her secession, and was loyal to *her*. General Thomas was loyal to the Nation, and therefore he was a traitor to the State!

This idea underlies all Southern politics. Until it is suppressed there can be no peace. What is virtue with us must of needs be vice to them in every national controversy. Their theory teaches them to believe that the Nation invaded the States, not that the States rebelled against the Nation.

Senator Gordon, who lately tried to break the force of Mr. Toombs' declarations, is as outspoken in what we of the North regard as treason as the more vulgar Georgian has ever been or as he is to-day. He is an honest,

candid witness, and this is what he said, under oath, to an investigating committee:

"We did not believe that the act of secession was treason. I do not believe it now. I do not expect ever to believe it.—(p. 334.)

"Question. When you surrendered did you not think you had been guilty of rebellion and treason?

"Answer. No, sir; I never had such an idea.

"Question. Did you not think that you were amenable to the law?

"Answer. No sir; not a bit of it.

"Question. As a matter of fact, did not the people of the South understand that they had been guilty of rebellion and treason, and were amenable to the law?

"Answer. No, sir.

"Question. That was not the impression in the public mind of the South?

"Answer. Not a bit of it. I do not believe there was an intelligent man in the South who believed then, or believes to-day, that he was guilty of treason, or anything that smacked of treason.

"Question. As a matter of fact, you do not think that the people down there regarded their immunity from trial and punishment, the restoration of their property, and their protection under the law, as manifestations of great clemency on the part of the Government to men who had been fighting for years to destroy it?

"Answer. No, sir, I do not think so."

[See "Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States"—Georgia, Vol. 1, page 342, 1872.]

We are told that although there are twenty-two Congressmen who now hold their seats by having overawed the negro vote, we are utterly powerless to help ourselves, or to protect our citizens thus cheated, because these wrongs were inflicted on them under the dread sovereignty of their States. But we are not *quite* powerless. Let no Republican vote a single dollar to any Southern scheme—good, bad, or indifferent—until the heresy of State Sovereignty is abjured, and until the poorest negro or the most hated native Republican is as free to cast his ballot everywhere as the ex-rebel or the copperhead is in Massachusetts or New York. If our army cannot bring unrepentant traitors to terms, our treasury has arguments that can fetch them to their knees. If muskets are unconstitutional, and it is criminal to interpose bayonets between loyal breasts and the bowie knives of the banditti, we have the constitutional power to refuse to aid these defayers of the national will in carrying out their plots or plans of any kind by money taken from the national Treasury. The War Power abolished slavery; let the Purse Power protect the loyalist. It is strong enough for this beneficent service!

REPUBLICAN EXPENDITURES—DEMOCRATIC RETRENCHMENT.

It may be well to remind the critics and carpers that the business of a government, speaking of it in its administrative capacity only, is not to save money, but to expend that with which it is entrusted economically and wisely. The cry of "retrenchment" is accepted by those who take the personal view of governmental action as a sure precursor of reform. A government is a trust, not a wealth-maker; it expends, but does not produce. It may be that unwise retrenchment will prove to be a very extravagant policy. Especially is this to be feared where the policy is dictated by mere greed of partisanship, and chiefly aims at crippling the administration of public affairs in order that a two-fold result may perhaps be achieved—the saving of certain sums in current appropriations, and the raising of a cry of inefficiency, when a crippled executive is unable to perform needed work in a proper manner.

The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives are engaged in a wholesale "rule and rote" process of cutting down salaries, and the administrative force required to do the necessary work of Government. As usual with that party when attempting any so-called reform, the beginning is seen in an attack on labor. The plan upon which they are proceeding seems far better adapted to promote inefficiency than it is to produce economy. Take, for instance, the proposed reduction of salaries. The highest and the lowest are to be treated alike. The efficient but poor first class clerk now receiving \$1,200 per annum is to lose ten per cent equally with the official who receives from \$3,000 to \$5,000 income, and even upwards. The laborer at \$720, and the lady copyist, or counter, at \$900 salary, are to lose proportionately the same amount as the head of the department in which they are employed. Then as to the reduction of the civil service staff. This policy again appears to be aimed at crippling the Executive much more than it does to the saving of money.

The efficient Representative from the Fifth

district of Maine, Hon. Eugene Hale, who has served for several years on the Appropriation Committee, made in the early part of the present session of Congress an exhaustive statement and defense of Republican legislation and policy in the matter of appropriations and expenditures. His facts and figures were marshaled with irresistible force. The speech gives a great deal of incisive information.

A good deal of ink as well as breath is wasted annually in Democratic criticisms of Republican extravagance. Most of this is based upon the annual estimates that are required by law to be laid before Congress. These estimates always exceed the appropriations, as actually made, by from twenty to thirty millions of dollars. It should be borne in mind, however, that administrative and executive officers are charged with continuous functions. They are often required to estimate in advance for work laid out or indicated but not yet begun. This is the case, for instance, with regard to river and harbor improvements under the direction of the army engineer bureau. Surveys are ordered to be made by every Congress, the engineer making the survey estimates, of course, for its cost. In this way the annual amount asked for swells to large proportions. The criticism of expenditures based therefore on such estimates is willfully or ignorantly at fault.

Mr. Hale claims, and justly too, credit for the Republicans in Congress, since the war, of largely reducing taxation, and also of lessening expenses, separating also to the apprehension of the public mind the expenditures created by the slaveholders' war and those directly related to the normal and current necessities of Government. How great the reduction of taxation has been may be seen by the fact that in five years, from 1863 to 1868, the American people paid in national taxes alone over \$2,200,000,000.

A valuable table of expenditures covering* twenty years, from 1856 to 1875, is given. The culminating point of expenditures was in 1865, being \$1,297,555,224.41. Ten years

after, 1875, it was \$274,623,392. The ratio of decrease from 1865 has been very great, as the figures show:

Year.	Net ordinary expenditures.	Year.	Net ordinary expenditures.
1865.....	\$39,571,025 79	1866.....	\$520,800,416 99
1867.....	67,795,707 66	1867.....	357,542,675 16
1868.....	74,185,270 39	1868.....	377,340,284 86
1869.....	69,070,976 74	1869.....	322,835,277 80
1869.....	63,130,598 39	1870.....	309,653,500 75
1861.....	66,546,641 80	1871.....	292,177,188 25
1862.....	474,761,818 91	1872.....	277,517,932 67
1863.....	714,740,725 17	1873.....	240,343,245 33
1864.....	865,322,641 97	1874.....	287,133,873 17
1865.....	1,297,555,224 41	1875.....	274,623,392 84

General James A. Garfield, when serving as chairman of the Appropriation Committee in the Forty-second and Forty-third Congress, presented an analytical statement and exhibit of the cost of that civil war, and of how large a proportion of the necessary appropriations are due to that source alone. The expenses growing directly out of the war include payment of interest on the public debt; of pensions; of collecting the internal revenue, (a system unnecessary before the war,) and of the claims for supplies, damages, &c. This class forms the first portion of our national expenditures. The second classification covers the military and naval establishments, and the third is that of the civil service proper. Mr. Hale presented in a table of expenses by years both the total and the per centage in each class or group, as follows:

	1875.	1874.	1873.	
FIRST GROUP.				
Amount paid directly on account of the late war.....	\$147,882,004 75		\$157,262,415 51	
Per cent. of whole for each year.....	53.7	53.3	54.	
SECOND GROUP.				
Army and Navy.....	48,314,499 50	58,038,305 09	52,998,982 25	
Per cent. of whole for each year.....	17.5	20.4	18.	
THIRD GROUP.				
Civil service proper.....	78,498,888 89	74,268,473 87	79,083,847 27	
Per cent. of whole for each year.....	28.6	25.9	22.	
Total.....	274,623,392 84	287,133,909 76	286,346,245 83	

The reductions above shown are the work of Republicans. Examining a little closer, and it will be seen that a Republican Congress had provided for the covering of unexpended balances into the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year; prohibited the use of any appropriation but for the definite purpose indicated; abolished indefinite appropriations in most instances where the practice had been handed down from Democratic days took action to prevent deficiencies, and to otherwise improve the service. These were all genuine reforms in the interest of both efficiency and economy.

The following table gives even a clearer view of the reductions that were made by the Republican majority in the Forty-second and Forty-third Congresses. The figures justify Mr. Hale's claim for the initiation of retrenchment and reform. The items are those of the civil service estimates proper, and while the purposes are not named, the amounts being given, the necessary comparisons are made complete:

Third session Forty-second Congress—fiscal year 1874.	First session Forty-third Congress—fiscal year 1875.	Second session Forty-third Congress—fiscal year 1876.
\$6,636,074 61	\$5,797,234 88	\$5,224,275 36
9,888,147 42	10,391,847 56	8,906,452 29
3,743,243 87	3,769,984 13	3,417,437 42
1,874,515 00	3,454,965 92	1,420,272 30
499,690 00	490,547 34	455,513 03
976,620 51	1,494,491 11	1,407,433 43
280,028 57	298,655 86	301,315 89
36,752,025 17	24,429,522 37	30,301,332 93
22,498,620 55	20,813,946 70	17,268,100 33
6,408,977 44	7,148,174 54	5,874,358 28
30,480,000 00	30,355,000 00	30,075,000 00
20,657,132 00	14,817,306 56	8,025,542 59
6,102,900 00	5,463,000 00	6,793,517 50
1,800,000 00	904,000 00	895,000 00
1,982,979 59	2,014,457 70	1,855,409 99
6,496,602 00	6,222,842 00	7,390,205 00
15,674,164 29	16,951,781 53	18,103,574 47
172,290,700 82	155,017,758 20	147,714,940 81

In an elaborate table recapitulating the acts under, and purposes for which appropriations were made at the Third session of the Forty-second and at the First session of the Forty-third Congress, Mr. Hale contrasts the character of the reductions made. For the fiscal year 1875 the appropriations were reduced for "deficiencies" from over eleven millions, the preceding fiscal year, to but little over four millions. The army appropriation was reduced over five millions; the

Indian by one and three-quarter millions; for forts and fortifications the reduction was over two millions, and proportionally in other instances. The following were the totals reported, and as amended and passed:

	Total Reported.	As Amended.
Appropriations for the fiscal year 1874, passed at the 3d sess. of the 42d Congress.....	\$173,200,700 82	\$170,424,900 82

Appropriations for the fiscal year 1875, passed at the 1st sess. of the 43d Congress.....	155,030,491 27	151,106,128 27
---	----------------	----------------

These totals include for 1875 appropriations for postage and various definite sums heretofore embraced under the general head of indefinite.

In the following table, carefully rearranged from Mr. Hale's figures, so as to present both contrast and summary, the reader will be able to see at a glance the difference between estimates and appropriations:

<i>Estimates Over Appropriations.</i>			Excess of latter.
Appropriations 1875.	Estimates 1877.		
Public works.....	\$28,501,410 30		\$11,836,348 20
Military establishment.....	33,697,178 50		5,142,190 71
Naval establishment.....	29,871,099 40		3,555,359 50
Miscellaneous.....	10,331,857 65		3,347,328 13
Postal service.....	13,881,188 73		903,307 19
Indian affairs.....	9,281,092 19		662,108 64
Judicial establishment.....	3,787,735 64		206 00
	3,403,259 05		
	90,068,296 45		25,447,992 37
<i>Appropriations Over Estimates.</i>			Excess of appropriations.
Appropriations 1876.	Estimates 1877.		
Pensions.....	\$30,000,000 00		\$468,500 00
Executive establishment.....	19,034,355 75		317,230 26
Legislative establishment.....	2,983,562 10		81,183 00
Foreign intercourse.....	1,412,985 00		60,500 00
Permanent appropriations.....	140,688,068 25		59,157 50
	193,099,881 12		1,001,500 85

It will be observed that the second table or division shows a positive reduction from the service standpoint of \$1,001,560.86. The increase or excess in estimates for the ensuing year over the current appropriations,

large as it may seem, is almost entirely in the class of estimated expenditures which legislation has required the several departments to report, but which it often happens, as is the case at present, there is no pressing necessity for meeting or undertaking. Of this class the item under head of "public works" is in proof. This alone comprises one-half of the seeming increase. The military and naval establishments are likely to have the pruning knife applied with severity, whether wisely or not, is a question to be settled with the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. But examination of the estimates will show many items which come under the same category as that of public works, useful things to be done, but not absolutely required. The discretion as to appropriating rests with the legislative branch of the Government; the administrative only obeys existing laws in presenting estimates of the probable cost of either initiating or completing such matters. Under the several heads of "Miscellaneous," "Postal Service," and "Judicial" there is probably good reasons to the public service for presenting enlarged estimates. This goes without telling, if the would-be critic reflects a moment as to the nature of the duties covered thereby.

On the whole, then, there is no honest grounds for assaults on the Republican policy in any preceding Congress or in the current estimates presented by the Executive Department upon the score of extravagance or the want of a spirit of retrenchment and economy. "Spigotry" is not a safe policy. To cut down the rations of professors, and deprive poorly paid clerks of their lawful salaries is a mean and contemptible way of saving the public moneys, especially when for the purpose of organizing a partisan raid on the Executive a Democratic House spends more in paying shorthand writers and in printing investigation reports than all that can be saved in the spigot fashion. It is cheap thunder this, manufactured behind the scenes with a sheet of iron and a mallet.

When the totals are made up for the present Congress it will be found that the Republican party will not suffer by comparison. Very probably the sum total appropriated this session will be much less than the foregoing figures, but this reduction will be so recklessly made as to necessitate a large deficiency bill at the next session, as well as impair the present efficiency of the service.

THE TARIFF—DOES PROTECTION PROTECT?

The proposition of free trade is, that unrestricted trade will secure better results—that is, more wealth—to this country than protection; or, in other words, that protection does not protect. In proof, the free-trader asserts that under protection one thousand bushels of wheat will purchase but fifteen tons of iron, when without protection, or were there no duty, one thousand bushels of wheat would purchase twenty-five tons of iron; so that we lose by protection ten tons of iron or the value thereof on every thousand bushels of wheat. This has the appearance of a mathematical demonstration, and many people are deceived by it. Were it true, the argument would be ended right here; but it is not true, and to show it is untrue is the task of the protectionist.

On the assumption of the free-trader, the ten tons of difference is the duty—that is what causes it, and that is what it is. The first fallacy is in assuming that this is lost. It is not lost. It has gone into the national treasury, and has saved raising an equal amount from the citizen by direct taxation. Taking the nation as a whole, it has received for the wheat exported fifteen tons of iron and the value of ten tons of iron in gold. This is self evident, and disposes of the proposition that the nation by imposing a duty on iron sacrifices the value of ten tons on a thousand bushels of wheat. It explodes the mathematical demonstration at the start.

But this is not all. There is another self evident proposition, which is: That the cost of transporting the wheat across the ocean, the loading, wharfage, port charges, cost of ships, officers, sailors, port charges, wharfage and handling in the foreign port, and freight to the consumer abroad, and the same items of cost on the return cargo of iron, are all so much tax on the wheat and iron, but principally on the wheat, and are a dead loss to the country, except that portion of the service which may be done by citizens of the country. To these must be added all the risks of the ocean, all the losses by the sinking of ships and cargoes, and all the money made by foreign insurance companies on the whole

of the export and import trade. These burdens have to be supported by the producers of the wheat and iron, and are so much loss to the property of the countries which make the exchanges. No other source for payment of these costs and losses can be imagined, and hence this consideration also explodes the theory of profit laid down by the free trader. No country can make as much by sending its wheat abroad to get iron, or cloth, or manufactured wares as by manufacturing them at home.

There is still another and stronger consideration in the case to be mentioned, which bears directly on the question of national wealth, though its relations naturally are very complex. What does a bushel of wheat represent? The answer depends on circumstances. If wheat is selling for one dollar, and the farmer having a surplus bushel lives at such a distance from market that it costs a dollar to transport the wheat, it represents nothing, and is valueless. Where the wheat commands a price which is paying, where the farmer can exchange a thousand bushels for twenty-five tons of iron, the wheat represents the labor which went to make the iron. That labor was embodied in the mind and hands of the human beings who dug the ore and manufactured it, and those human beings imply hatters, tanners, shoemakers, cloth-makers, tailors, and all sorts and kinds of mechanics and artisans and laborers. The wheat sustains the life of the iron-maker, and the iron-maker employs the hatters, shoemakers, tailors, cloth-makers, and laborers—hence the wheat represents the producing power of all these classes, amounting in value to the worth of twenty-five tons of iron per one thousand bushels, or one thousand dollars, more or less, expressed in coin. A thousand bushels of wheat represent, therefore, so much producing power in human life, or machinery, which is the product of human life. In other words, so much property.

Bearing this in mind, it is apparent that the country which raises its thousand bushels of wheat and sends them to a foreign country in exchange for twenty-five tons of

iron, after the exchange has only the value of the iron left, while the country which exchanges its wheat for home-made iron has both the iron *and* the wheat, the latter being represented in the producing power of the hatters, shoemakers, and other operatives who have supplied the wants of the iron-maker. It ought not to require any argument to show that the building and operating of a manufactory of any kind, except ardent spirits, is a positive source of wealth to a country ; but the free trade proposition denies this, and contends that it is more profitable to import goods than to manufacture them. We are purposely leaving out at this point all questions between the farmer and manufacturer and laborer in order to meet the free-trade proposition squarely on its national aspect, unembarrassed by any class interests, real or supposed. The proposition we are combating concerns the nation as a body, and however individuals may fare it cannot be true that national wealth is promoted by having its goods made abroad.

So far from the proposition being a mathematical demonstration, it becomes self-evident that the farmer and manufacturer can do better near together than wide apart, and the nation which secures all its business at home will accumulate faster than by dividing it with another nation.

The idea of protection is to build up home business. The making of hats, boots, cloth, tools, machines, and all kinds of wares is what creates business, and so far as our supplies come from abroad that amount of business at home is killed. To meet this objection the free trader says: "No; we will raise so much more grain that we will make up for the amount lost." This is pure assumption. We won't do any such thing. No purely grain-growing country ever did that, and it cannot be done. It cannot be done because of the extra costs and charges of foreign transportation; because of the fact that in exchanging commodities across the ocean there are immense losses which fall upon the producers; and because that in the exchange we part with an equivalent which, on the home theory, is retained.

There are other reasons why it cannot be done. An agricultural country cannot de-

velop and utilize its producing force: never did and never can. A good portion of the men born into the world have no taste for agriculture, and never amount to much as farmers. There are feeble men and boys and girls who can accomplish much in the mechanic arts, who earn nothing on the farm; and it is only by diversified labor that the full producing power of the community can be called into exercise. As national wealth can only result from producing power and power that is exercised, it follows that an agricultural community which cannot possibly utilize its full working force must fall behind other countries in wealth. The example of England in manufacturing shows this on a large scale, and the purely farming towns in New England show it on a small scale. Philosophy and fact agree on this.

In shipping agricultural products abroad there is also a process of exhaustion of the soil going on which, though slow and inappreciable, amounts to an immense loss in time. Our richest lands ultimately wear out, and tracts which not many years ago were exporting wheat are now buyers of flour.

We have now said enough to explode one of the leading assumptions of free trade and to establish the necessity of manufactures as essential to the highest prosperity of the community. The experience of the country coincides with this view, as we will show further on.

In order to make the most profitable exchanges of products possible the producers must be near together. The man who sells grain needs cloth, and the man who sells cloth needs grain, and they both are benefited by being near each other. The country has to have both to insure prosperity; and this for yet another reason: the contiguity of the tradesmen with the farmers enables them to assist each other in building and maintaining highways, bridges, schoolhouses, churches, and all public works; the operatives assist in paying the taxes, which otherwise must be paid by the farmer alone, and they create a demand for a great variety of agricultural products, vegetables, and small fruits which cannot be exported, and whose value to the farmer must be lost without this home market.

To make the nation prosperous we must produce both the wheat and the iron, and everything else in our power, because only thus can we find employment for all varieties of talent.

It requires no argument to prove to a shoemaker that the importation of a large quantity of English shoes will aid to glut the market and deprive his craft of employment to the amount of the importation. These foreign goods take the place of the same quantity of American goods, and lessen American production and property to the same extent. It superadds foreign competition to home competition, as all can see, and breaks down the home artisan and manufacturer just to the extent that the importation takes place of any article which the home artisan can supply, be it shoes, hats, cloth, tools, or wares of any kind.

At this point free trade says: "Well, the effect of importation is to lessen the prices of goods; and while it may also lessen the wages of the workman he will be compensated by being able to buy his goods cheaper, and he can live enough cheaper to make up for the reduction of wages." This position is not sustained by facts. The price-lists under our protective tariffs show that goods have fallen in price and wages have kept steady.

The most prosperous years this country has known were those succeeding the protective tariffs from 1824 to 1834, from 1842 to 1848, and after 1863 to 1873, and the most unfortunate years have been those succeeding the revenue tariffs of 1832 and 1848 and the tariff reductions of 1872. The facts, therefore, do not sustain the proposition, that in consequence of cheap goods imported from foreign countries the laborer can make himself whole for the loss in wages. It is not so, and we have the reasons why: 1. Because labor is the first to suffer from a fall in prices, and the last to recover. Since September, 1872, work has been scarce, and wages low, but beef, pork, flour, and rents remain nearly the same—the concessions have been trifling, as all laboring men are aware. 2. Because the effect of heavy importations of manufactured goods of the same kinds as made in this country is not so much

in the reduction of wages as in throwing the workman out of employment, so that he is deprived of the means to buy at *any* price, no matter how cheap goods may be. He remains idle for a time, and finally must take up some new calling, something he does not understand, or is not expert in, and so is put at a great disadvantage compared with his former condition. Experience has settled this. 3. If we concede that a fall in prices follows a reduction of the tariff, the benefit of that fall enures to the consumers of the kinds of goods on which the fall occurs. These goods are the finer and more costly kinds, such as are not used by laboring men and their families, and consequently the benefit of the reduction enures to the wealthy classes almost exclusively, and the revenue has to be made up by taxing the necessities of life, tea and coffee, which are used as much by the laboring classes as any other. The theory and the facts agree. The laborer under free trade, granting that goods can be purchased cheaper, finds taxes increased, and ability to pay diminished. He may possibly buy a three-dollar hat for two dollars, but if he cannot find employment he cannot get the two dollars, and then the price of hats is immaterial to him. Work is what he needs, and without it he can have no hat. The importation of the foreign hat has driven the home hatter into the labor market as a competitor of the laborer, and thus wages have been depressed.

And this process has enured to the benefit of the non-producer. The merchant, lawyer, schoolmaster, professor, and retired capitalist can all buy their clothes and all other goods cheaper, they can hire their help cheaper, their servants, coachman, gardeners, and mechanics who build and repair their stables and houses. The supposed interests of these non-producing classes make them favor low wages, for low wages make cheap goods, and also make them opponents of protection. On the other hand, the interests of the laboring man require protection, for the plain reason that no possible cheapening of goods can compensate him for the loss of employment, which is sure to follow large importations of manufactured goods. The fall in wages and lost time will always exceed

the gain to him by the cheapening of goods.

Passing now from the general effect of a protective tariff upon national wealth and the interests of the laborer, we will consider the argument as presented to the farmer. The free trader tells the farmer that he sells 1,000 bushels of wheat and the money received for it will buy fifteen tons of iron, but adopt free trade, and he will get for the same wheat not less than twenty-five tons of iron, and other goods in proportion. This is pure assumption. There is not a particle of truth in it. No such thing would happen. It could not possibly happen except for a very short period of time, and under exceptional circumstances. The argument is, that the price of wheat to the farmer is governed by the price in Liverpool, representing the manufacturing centers whose population demands food, and that by reducing our tariff so as to invite importations of goods not only would the goods become cheaper to the farmer, but the ability to buy food on the part of the operatives in foreign countries would create an increased demand for breadstuffs and other farm products. This argument flies in the face of the proposition that manufacturers add to the general wealth of the country. This cannot be, and it also be true that it is better to get our supplies of goods from abroad. One or the other proposition must fall. We have shown affirmatively that our proposition is true, and why, and will now try to show why the counter proposition is false.

This is shown in part by the fact which we have already made plain that the amount of the duty is not a total loss but has gone into the treasury and the farmer has paid it on iron, when otherwise he would have paid it on something else. This, however, does not meet that part of the case where it is alleged that the duty has increased the price of the domestic article to the same amount of the foreign, because then no duty has been paid. But this latter statement as to increase of price is also an assumption not proved, but is contradicted by the free trader himself; for in his appeal for a tax on tea and coffee he confidently asserts that the added duty will not enhance the price a particle; and if

not in the case of tea and coffee, which cannot be grown here, it certainly will not raise the price on goods which can be produced here and are subject to both home and foreign competition. In assuming that the growers of tea and coffee will pay all the duty imposed on those articles so that the price will remain the same to the consumer the advocate of free trade destroys his own assumption that a duty on manufactured goods necessarily or really compels an advance of price. The free trader disposes of his own proposition, and we are not obliged to meet an argument that has been abandoned. Nevertheless, suppose we admit that a protective duty does add to prices, as it doubtless does in some cases, does the farmer suffer in consequence? We answer, no! There is no possible loss under any conceivable state of things in the long run that is not fully compensated under the operation of the tariff. The farmer, like every business man, must look at the effect of things, not merely for a day but for a period. When the farmer plants an orchard he does not expect to sell apples from it the first year, nor the second, but he is laying the foundation for profit to come some years in the future. For the first few years there is a certainty of loss. So with a tariff. The first year or two there may be a disadvantage in some cases, but in the end never. The farmer secures compensation for his first loss or sacrifice by securing the building up of a market near at hand, where he can sell various products which will not bear long transportation: milk, fruits, poultry, eggs, wood and timber, staves, and a great variety of things which are worthless without a home market. He is compensated also by the home market, because it makes him independent of the fluctuations and influences that operate on foreign markets. The home market is his own. The foreign farmer can never come in and take it from him by underselling. The mechanics and laborers are his sure customers, and he has only the one danger, that Providence will give a larger crop than he prays for, so as to break down the price of corn. Having a home market he can diversify his productions and not be entirely dependent upon wheat and corn, beef and pork. Should

there be an immense crop abroad so that it will not pay to ship grain, the home market is always there to buy his produce and supply him with money to meet his obligations. The home market is always the better of the two, for it buys vastly more, and can buy nowhere else. The farmer is sure of it all the time. If the farmer is shrewd he will not destroy or damage his best customer. That is suicide.

In showing the effect of protection upon business there is of late years the difficulty of separating the influences due to railroads, steam power, and improved machinery from those due to protection, but by going back to the years succeeding 1820 there is no such embarrassment, for there were no railroads then, and the other influences had not begun to operate in any large measure. The protective tariffs most complained of were passed in 1824 and 1828. Business had been bad, and growing bad for three years. In a report made to the Legislature of Pennsylvania in 1823 it was stated that there was going on "ruinous sacrifices of landed property at sheriff's sales, whereby lands and houses have been sold at less than half their value—forced sales of merchandise, farming stock and utensils, at prices far below the cost of production, by which numerous families have been deprived of the necessities of life and the implements of their trade." Pennsylvania was then an agricultural State. On the 24th of February, 1824, Mr. Carter, of South Carolina, made a speech in Congress, and said: "In all that region which stretches from the shores of the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico, where all the arts of civilized life once triumphed, the arm of industry is now paralyzed. Large and ample estates, once the seats of opulence, which supported their proprietors in affluence and comfort, are now thrown out to waste and decay." "The farmer of the grain-growing States will tell you that he has large annual surplusses of grain which he is doomed year after year to see rot and perish on his hands." Mr. Garnet, of Virginia, said, "desolation is spread over the country." The Charleston, South Carolina, *Memorial* of February 24 says: "A feeling of gloomy despondence is beginning to prevail everywhere in the lower country."

To meet this universal depression which prevailed in New England and Ohio, as well as in Pennsylvania and the South, a tariff was proposed, and the free traders declared that it would complete the ruin of the country. Mr. Tatnall, a representative from Georgia, exclaimed: "Are you prepared by passing this infernal bill to add to a poverty which is already wearing one portion of our country to the bone for the purpose of supplying the appetites of a few pampered nabobs?" Such was the view taken of the tariff bill, but they passed it, nevertheless, and now let us look at consequences:

In 1821 Government securities were selling at seventy-five cents.

In 1830 the same class of securities sold for ninety-four cents.

In 1822 the United States Bank had on hand less than four millions of gold.

In 1830 the United States Bank had on hand ten millions eight hundred thousand in gold.

In 1822 the debt of our people to England exceeded \$50,000,000.

In 1830 the English were in debt to us.

In 1822 the Government borrowed five millions to meet interest on the public debt.

In 1831 there had been paid all the interest, and sixty-six millions of the principal of the public debt.

The average increase of capital in manufactures from 1824 to 1830 was seventeen millions per annum.

In 1822 the exports of cotton were 134,000,000 pounds.

In 1830 the exports of cotton had reached 264,000,000 pounds.

In 1822 the exports of rice were 87,000 tierces.

In 1830 the exports of rice reached 171,000 tierces.

In 1822 our tonnage was 1,311,000 tons.

In 1830 our tonnage had reached 1,741,000 tons.

In 1823, the last year of low tariff, our exports were \$47,000,000.

In 1830, after five years of protection, our exports reached \$74,000,000.

In 1823 our imports were \$77,000,000.

In 1830 our imports were \$70,000,000, thus bringing the balance of trade in our favor.

The customs revenue went up in the same time from \$19,000,000 to \$21,000,000.

In 1822 we exported more specie than we imported by..... \$6,440,000

In 1829 we imported more specie than we exported by..... 3,083,000

Difference in our favor..... 9,523,000

And this is the way the ruin went on in all branches of business. The result of it was that in the agricultural districts, where the paupers in 1821 were one to every 128 of the people, in 1831 they stood one to 344 of the population. Allowing one able-bodied man to five of population, in 1821 every 26 men had a pauper to maintain, while in 1831 there was only one pauper to 69 able-bodied men in the agricultural districts.

These figures show a general increase of business in all departments, agriculture, manufactures, banking and commerce; and they not only indicate, they prove an advance from a state of general depression and poverty to a condition of buoyancy, hope, comfort, and prosperity. The evils predicted by the free traders did not happen, the expectations of the friends of the tariff were more than fulfilled. Under the operation of the measure we became exporters of manufactured goods instead of importers; we paid the national debt instead of borrowing money to pay the interest of it; and it was done so easily that a large surplus revenue was accumulated which in 1837 was distributed among the States, amounting to \$37,000,000. So manifest was our condition that the administration of General Jackson, which was reaping the benefit of the good times, became immensely popular, and in his annual messages he never failed to speak of the "cheering evidences of general welfare and progressive improvement" in a way that indicated the most perfect complacency at the situation.

All this prosperity came to an end, however, when Mr. Clay's compromise measures began to produce results. The reductions by that bill permitted foreign goods to come once more in competition with our own manufactures, and in 1837 our industries were completely prostrated and did not recover until the passage of the protective tariff of 1842.

And from these reasons, supported by these facts, it is concluded that protection does protect notwithstanding the ciphering of the "Parsee" and Mr. David A. Wells.

And now, what is the attitude of the Democratic party on the question? The Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means has prepared a bill whose main purpose seems to be the same as was accomplished in the compromise of 1832. If carried, instead of a revival of industry we may look with positive certainty for a deeper and more permanent depression.

NOTE.—In regard to the matter of price as affected by duties, it turned out that after the passage of the tariff of 1824 prices on foreign goods on which increased duties were levied did not rise, but in most cases fell, and the same happened again in 1828. Mr. Samuel D. Bradford, a leading importer of Boston at that time, said: "My house are large operators, and our commercial connections are extensive in Great Britain, Russia, and India, and we imported freely in 1828, and can truly say that nearly every article we imported was actually worth less to us than in the previous year under the old duty." Other great merchants said the same, among them Windsor Fay, Grant & Seaver, Henry Gassett & Co., Horner & Dorr, F. & R. Thompson, of Philadelphia, and numerous other well-known houses. There was a decline in broadcloths, buckings, kerseys, serges, vestings, flannels, Russia goods generally, cottons, worsteds, hosiery, and blankets. Casimeres which cost importers \$1.60 per yard under the tariff of 1824 were sold under the tariff of 1828 at \$1.55. For several years ending 1827 the duty on molasses had been 5 cents per gallon, and molasses sold for 37½ cents. The tariff of 1828 raised the duty to 10 cents, and for the three years ending 1830, that is 1828, '29, and '30, the average price of molasses was but 27 cents per gallon. Thus do facts show how utterly false is the assumption that duties add to the cost of goods to the consumer.

SQUARING THE OLD ACCOUNT.—At the breaking out of the rebellion Democratic officeholders from the South squared accounts with Uncle Sam by running away with the balance of money and property in their charge. Now that Democracy has got possession of the House of Representatives it proposes to restore to Uncle Sam an amount about equal to the shortcomings of its early *ante bellum* appointees. The method proposed is an easy one. Take from the salaries of Republican officials from ten to twenty per cent., and cut down the necessary appropriations to an amount equal to the amount stolen by Southern Democrats and the accounts are squared. There is something sublime in the impudence displayed by the Democrats in carrying out their novel plan of restoration, but they will find out in the Presidential campaign that the taxing of Republicans will not cover up the sins of Democratic officials.

RELATIONS OF THE STATE TO RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF ALL THE PROVISIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE SEVERAL STATES; ALSO THE PROVISIONS OF LAW IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIES BEARING UPON THE CHURCH, THE STATE, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

In the present condition of the public mind and the wide-spread interest felt in the questions at issue, no apology is necessary for the presentation of the several Constitutional requirements now existing by which the present status of the public schools, and of the several religious sects, in their attitude toward Nation and States are defined. This presentation will be found invaluable to the editor, writer, and speaker. The student will not fail to note also the manner in which this summary illustrates the growth of public opinion to a more purely secular method of dealing with these issues than was manifested in earlier days. The only provisions to be found in the Constitution of the United States which bear directly upon the subject-matters are the following:

Article VI, Section third, directs the taking of an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution, to be taken by United States Senators, Representatives, *the members of the several State Legislatures*, all judicial and executive officers, "but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." In the amendments the Constitution provides "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.—Art. I.

The argument has also been made that Article IX, which reads as follows: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people," allows the States to do what the first amendment prohibits the Union from doing, viz: establishing and maintaining a State religion. It would seem as if this interpretation was either hastily made, or obviously strained, as the Union would not be likely to stipulate that the States might, in detail, each for themselves, do that which both States and People (taking either view that is held as

to the source of Federal power and Constitution) prohibit the whole—the collective States or National Unity—from doing:

PART I.—*Taxation of Church Property.*

Houses used exclusively for public worship shall never be taxed.—*Ark.*, 1868.

Property used for religious purposes may be exempted by law.—*Fla.*, 1868.

Taxation shall be uniform on all species of property taxed.—*Georgia*, 1868.

Property used exclusively for religious purposes may be exempted from taxation by general law.—*Ill.*, 1870.

Property used for religious purposes may be exempted by law.—*Ind.*, 1851.

Property used exclusively for religious purposes shall be exempt from taxation.—*Kansas*, 1859.

The General Assembly shall have power to exempt from taxation property actually used for church, school, or charitable purposes.—*La.*, 1868.

All taxes upon real estate assessed by authority of this State shall be apportioned and assessed equally, according to the just value thereof.—*Maine*, 1820.

Taxation shall be levied on such property as shall be prescribed by law.—*Mich.*, 1850.

Property used exclusively for religious purposes may be exempt from taxation.—*Minn.*, 1857-8.

Taxation shall be equal and uniform throughout the State. All property shall be taxed in proportion to its value, to be ascertained as directed by law.—*Miss.*, 1868; *Cal.*, 1879; *La.*, 1868.

The property of corporations formed for religious purposes may be exempt from taxation by law.—*Neu.*, 1864.

All property subject to taxation ought to be taxed in proportion to its value.—*Mo.*, 1865.

The General Assembly may exempt from taxation property held for religious purposes.—*N. C.*, 1868.

Burying grounds and houses used exclusively for public worship may be exempted from taxation by general law.—*Ohio*, 1850, 1851.

Property used for religious purposes may be exempted from taxation by law.—*Oregon*, 1857.

Churches and burying grounds are exempt from taxation.—*S. C.*, 1868.

The Legislature may exempt from taxation property used exclusively for religious purposes.—*Tenn.*, 1870.

All property in this State shall be taxed in proportion to its value, &c., except such property as two-thirds of both Houses of the Legislature may think proper to exempt from taxation.—*Texas*, 1869.

The Legislature may exempt all property used exclusively for religious purposes.—*Va.*, 1870.

Property used for religious purposes may by law be exempted from taxation.—*W. Va.*, 1861.

The rule of taxation shall be uniform, and taxes shall be levied upon such property as the Legislature shall prescribe.—*Wis.*, 1848.

The property of corporations shall forever be subject to taxation the same as property of individuals, except corporations for educational and charitable purposes.—*Ala.*, 1868.

No man, or sect of men, are entitled to exclusive public emoluments or privileges from the community.—*Conn.*, 1818.

No man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive separate public emoluments or privileges from the community but in consideration of public services.—*Ky.*, 1850.

Every person in the State, or person holding property therein, ought to contribute his proportion of public taxes for the support of the government, according to his actual worth in real or personal property.—*Md.*, 1867.

The property of corporations shall forever be subject to taxation the same as property of individuals.—*Neb.*, *Church Property*, 1867.

Provision may be made by general laws for securing the title to church property, so that it may be held and used for the purpose intended.—*W. Va.*, 1861.

The quantity of land which may be held by any religious body corporate, in connection with a house of worship or a parsonage, shall not exceed five acres in the county or one acre in a town or city.—*Mo.*, 1865.

Property can only be held by such body corporate through a board of trustees selected by themselves.—*Mo.*, 1865.

The General Assembly may secure the title to church property to an extent to be limited by law.—*Va.*, 1870.

No charter of incorporation shall be granted to any church or religious denomination.—*W. Va.*, 1861.

Religious corporations cannot be established except by general law.—*Mo.*, 1865.

The General Assembly shall not grant a charter of incorporation to any church or religious denomination.—*Va.*, 1870.

PART II.—*Devises and Successions.*

The gift, sale, or devise of land to ministers or religious sects or orders, or for the support of, or in trust for, any minister or preacher of the gospel, as such, or for any religious denomination or order, shall, except as above limited, be void.—*Mo.*, 1865.

Every gift or sale of goods or chattels to go in succession, or to take place after the death of the seller or donor, for such purposes shall be void.—*Mo.*, 1865.

Devises of goods or chattels for such purposes, or to any person in trust for such purposes, are void.—*Mo.*, 1865.*

Any devise or conveyance of land or other property to ministers, as such, or for the support of any religious sect, without the sanction of the Legislature, is void, except not exceeding five acres of land for church, parsonage, or burying ground.—*Md.*, 1867.

No special provisions respecting the taxation or exemption of property held for religious purposes are found in the following constitutions:—*Del.*, 1831; *Iowa*, 1857; *Mass.*, 1780; *N. H.*, 1792; *N. J.*, 1844; *N. Y.*, 1846-'67; *Pa.*, 1838; *R. I.*, 1842; *Vt.*, 1793.

A summary of provisions respecting exemption from taxation of property held for religious purposes.

Churches are exempt.—*Arkansas*.

Churches and burying grounds are exempt.—*South Carolina*.

Churches and burying grounds may be exempted by general law.—*Ohio*.

Property used exclusively for religious purposes shall be exempt.—*Kansas*.

The Legislature has special power to exempt by general law in the following States:—*Fla.*, *Ill.*, *Ind.*, *La.*, *Minn.*, *Nev.*, *N. C.*, *Oregon*, *Tenn.*, *Va.*, *W. Va.*

The Legislature may prescribe the property on which taxes may be levied.—*Cal.*, *La.*, *Mich.*, *Miss.*, *Mo.*, *Texas*, *Wis.*

Exemptions apparently not authorized in *Ala.*, *Conn.*, *Ky.*, *Md.*, *Neb.*

The constitutions are silent in *Del.*, *Iowa*, *Mass.*, *N. H.*, *N. J.*, *N. Y.*, *Pa.*, *R. I.*, *Vt.* In the Territories and District of Columbia.

The legislative assemblies of Colorado, Dakota, and Wyoming shall not make any

*These provisions are in the main retained under the constitution adopted in 1875, an instrument on which, however, only a minority of the suffragans in the State cast their ballots.

discrimination in taxing different kinds of property, but all property subject to taxation shall be taxed in proportion to its value.—*U. S. Revised Statutes, Sec. 1925.*

In Washington Territory all taxes shall be equal and uniform, and no distinctions shall be made in the assessments between different kinds of property, but the assessments shall be according to the value of the property.—*U. S. Revised Statutes, Sec. 1924.*

Limitations upon amount of property which may be held for religious purposes.

No corporation or association for religious or charitable purposes shall acquire or hold real estate in any Territory, during the existence of the Territorial Government, of a greater value than \$50,000, and all real estate acquired or held by such corporation or association contrary hereto shall be forfeited, and escheat to the United States.—*U. S. Revised Statutes, Sec. 1890.*

District of Columbia.

All churches and school houses, and all buildings, grounds, and property appurtenant thereto, and used in connection therewith in the District, and any cemetery therein, held and owned by a religious society, having a known and regular place of worship, or by any incorporated association, shall be exempt from any and all taxes or assessments, national or municipal.—*U. S. Revised Statutes, District of Columbia, Sec. 147.*

Societies or congregations formed under the general incorporation act of May 5, 1870, for the purpose of religious worship may receive by gift, devise, or purchase a quantity of land not exceeding one acre for the erection of buildings, &c.—*U. S. Revised Statutes, District of Columbia, Sec. 533.*

The quantity of land authorized to be conveyed and held for the use of religious congregations prior to May 5, 1870, and subsequent to June 17, 1844, was fifty acres in the county of Washington, and three acres in the cities of Washington or Georgetown, and such property "shall not be held by the trustees of such congregation for any other use than as a place of public worship, religious or other instruction, burial ground, or residence of their minister."—*U. S. Revised Statutes, District of Columbia, Sec. 456.*

Part II—School Funds.

The school fund shall remain a perpetual fund, and the interest shall be inviolably appropriated to the support and encouragement of the public or common schools throughout the State, and for the equal benefit of all the people thereof, and no law shall ever be made authorizing said fund to be diverted to any other use than the encouragement and support of public or common schools among the several school

societies, as justice and equity may require.—*Conn., 1818.*

The permanent fund for the support of public schools shall remain a perpetual fund for that purpose, and shall not be borrowed, appropriated, or used for any other purpose, under any pretense whatever.—*R. I., 1842.*

The school fund shall remain a perpetual fund, and the interest shall not be used for any other purpose than the support of public schools under any pretense whatever.—*N. J., 1844.*

The capital of the common school fund shall remain inviolate, and the revenue shall be applied to the support of the common schools.—*N. Y., 1846-'67.*

The revenues from the school fund and school lands shall be faithfully applied.—*Wis., 1848.*

Shall be inviolably appropriated to the support of common schools.—*Cal., 1849.*

The principal of all funds granted or intrusted to the State for educational and religious purposes shall forever be preserved inviolate and undiminished, and the income arising therefrom shall be faithfully applied to the specific objects of the original grants or appropriations.—*Ohio, 1850-'51; Neb., 1867.*

All school funds, however derived, shall be inviolably applied to the specific objects of the original gift, grant, or appropriation.—*Mich., 1850.*

School funds and moneys raised by taxation for the support of common schools shall be held inviolate, and shall be applied to no other purpose.—*Ky., 1850.*

The income of the common school fund shall be inviolably appropriated to the support of common schools, and to no other purpose whatever.—*Ind., 1851.*

All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the State for the support of common schools, shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is to be expended.—*Mass., 1855, (amendment).**

The income of the school fund, and such other money as the General Assembly may provide, shall be inviolably appropriated to the support of common schools throughout the State.—*Iowa, 1857.*

All public school funds shall forever be preserved inviolate, and the income shall be

* This provision was defeated in 1855 by a pro-Catholic combination, engineered by the Democrats. It was afterward resubmitted and ratified.

faithfully applied to the specific objects of the original grants or appropriations.—*Minn.*, 1857-'8.

The common school fund shall be separate and irreducible, and the revenues shall be exclusively applied to the support and maintenance of common schools in each school district, and purchase of suitable libraries and apparatus therefor.—*Oregon*, 1857.

The increase of the school fund and such other means as the Legislature may provide, by taxation or otherwise, shall be inviolably appropriated to the support of common schools.—*Kansas*, 1857.

The interest of the school fund shall be annually applied to the support of free schools throughout the State, and to no other purpose whatever.—*W. Va.*, 1867.

All school funds are solemnly pledged for educational purposes, and shall not be transferred to any other fund for any other uses.—*Nevada*, 1864.

The school funds shall be faithfully appropriated for establishing and maintaining the free schools and university, and for no other uses or purposes whatever.—*Mo.*, 1865.

The school fund of the State shall be kept inviolate, and appropriated only to the purposes of education.*—*Md.*, 1867.

School funds shall be inviolably appropriated to educational purposes, and to no other purpose whatever.—*Ala.*, 1868.

And for no other uses or purposes whatever.—*Ark.*, 1868.

The interest of the school fund shall be exclusively applied to the support and maintenance of common schools.—*Fla.*, 1868.

The school fund shall be sacredly preserved as an irreducible educational fund, the annual income of which, together with so much of the ordinary revenue of the State as may be necessary, shall be faithfully appropriated for establishing and perfecting in this State a system of free public schools, and for no other purposes or uses whatever.—*N. C.*, 1868.

The income of the school fund, together with such other means as the General Assembly may provide, shall be faithfully appropriated for the purpose of establishing and maintaining free public schools, and for no other purposes or uses whatever.—*S. C.*, 1868.

The school funds shall remain a perpetual fund, the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated for the support of free schools.—*Miss.*, 1868.

¶* It will be perceived that this provision does not prevent the appropriation of school moneys to private schools or for sectarian purposes.

Shall remain inviolate.—*La.*, 1868.

The common school fund shall be a perpetual fund, and no law shall be made authorizing said fund or any part thereof to be diverted to any other use than the support and encouragement of common schools.—*Tenn.*, 1870.

The public school fund, and the school taxes provided for, shall be a perpetual fund, and shall be applied exclusively for the education of all the scholastic inhabitants of this State; and no laws shall ever be made appropriating such fund for any other use or purpose whatever.—*Texas*, 1869.

Religion in the Public Schools.

No religious or other sect, or sects, shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds of this State.—*Ohio*, 1850-'51; *Ark.*, 1868; *Neb.*, 1867.

The school moneys shall never be appropriated to any religious sect for the maintenance, exclusively, of its own school.—*Mass.*, (amendment), 1855.

No religious sect or sects shall ever control any part of the common school or university fund of the State.—*Kansas*, 1859.

No sectarian instruction shall be imparted or tolerated in any school or university that may be established under this Constitution.—*Nevada*, 1864.

No appropriations shall be made by the General Assembly for the support of any private school or any private institution of learning whatever.—*La.*, 1868.

No religious sect or sects shall ever control any part of the school or university funds of this State.—*Miss.*, 1868.

No religious sect or sects shall have exclusive right to or control of any part of the school funds of the State, nor shall sectarian principles be taught in the public schools.—*S. C.*, 1868.

Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever any thing in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be made by the State or any such public corporation to any church or for any sectarian purpose.—*Ill.*, 1870.

Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, township, school district, or other municipal corporation shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public

fund whatever anything in aid of any creed, church, or sectarian purpose, or to help, support, or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other institution of learning, controlled by any creed, church, or sectarian denomination whatever, nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by State, county, city, town, or such public corporation, for any creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever.—*Mo.*, (amendment,) 1870.

[NOTE.—This amendment was ratified by the people, November 8, 1870, by a majority of 15,329. It is embraced also in the constitution of 1875.]

PART III.—*Public Support of Religious Institutions.*

No money shall be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or religious or theological seminaries.—*Wis.*, 1848.

No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary, nor shall any property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purpose.—*Mich.*, 1850.

No money shall be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious or theological institution.—*Ind.*, 1851; *Oregon*, 1857.

Nor shall any money be appropriated for the payment of any religious service in either House of the Legislative Assembly.—*Oregon*, 1857.

No money shall be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries.—*Minn.*, 1857-8.

The several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies shall have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.—*N. H.*, 1792.

All religious societies shall have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and contracting with them for their support.—*Me.*, 1820.

Religious societies shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support, and to raise money for the erection of houses for public worship and the maintenance of religious instruction.—*Mass.*, (amendment,) 1833.

THE TRUTH OF HISTORY AND THE HORRORS OF ANDERSONVILLE.

With no desire to arouse vindictive feelings or bitter memories are the following facts reproduced. Memories most sad, sufferings most intense, attend every page and incident of the black record. But there is a duty to be performed. The men who defended slavery, and in so doing sought to rend the American Union, have, through the mouths of their chosen representatives and their accepted leader—in the interest of a new and more dangerous movement to conquer what they failed to destroy—defiantly denied the justice of a verdict once rendered. They now seek to add insult to injury by declaring the National Government responsible for the atrocities of Andersonville, and as being guilty of greater crimes against the rebel soldiers in his hands as prisoners of war than were perpetrated in that and kindred pandemoniums.

The extracts herewith given are from a letter written by one who was a private soldier at the time, but whose education and character fitted him for a much more responsible position. Mr. Wallsh was an important

witness at the trial of Wirz. The testament to which allusion is made was a small pocket volume, on the margins of whose pages Mr. Wallsh pencilled a diary, some extracts from which are here given. On his release he transcribed these notes literally, and now possesses the sacred book and the manuscript one in which his notes were written. The statements bear the stamp of truth.

It is worthy of note, at this point, that the defense of insufficient supplies, as against the charge of premeditated starvation of our men, is set at rest by the fact that during the very year in which Mr. Wallsh and his comrades were so cruelly treated, General Sherman's army of about sixty thousand men marched through the State of Georgia, one wing of it passing within fifty or sixty miles of the prison pen, and subsisted entirely from the country through which they moved.

ABUNDANCE OF PROVISIONS IN THE CONFEDERACY.

A recent letter from North Carolina, written by one who was in the Confederacy throughout the rebellion, and with ample

facilities for knowing, calls attention to the following facts :

"That it was well known that there was such an outcry against the planting of so much cotton that in some cases it raised a suspicion of loyalty (that word was a very popular one in the South during the rebellion) against those who, as before the war, planted nearly all their land in cotton. The corn and pork crops were immense, and particularly so in the latter years. Money was, of course, drawn away into the rebel army. In the western part of this State, (North Carolina,) there were very plentiful crops of wheat raised. This was the case, too, in northern Georgia. Sherman found very large quantities of supplies for his army in his 'march to the sea.' It is well remembered here that it was the boast of the Confederates—the warm war ones—that upon a suggestion of the high prices of provisions in their paper money, the reply was very promptly made that the gold would bring forth any quantity of provisions, and at low prices.

"When Schofield's army came through here (1864-'5) they found vast quantities of provisions and forage, and that, too, where there had been loud talk of a scarcity when the Confederate tithing officers were round. Schofield was largely supplied as he went along. And yet provisions could not be had for Andersonville in all Georgia and Alabama—the plantation States. We here know that is all 'bosh,' if Jefferson Davis and his cohorts assert it till their tongues turn as black as their nefarious principles.

"As further evidence of the fact that there was no scarcity, let it be remembered that the accounts rendered for supplies taken by the Union armies have been many in number, and ample in amount. The Quartermaster General's office has received very many. Others have been presented through another channel. Very many are still held back, awaiting the advent to power of a different influence, when these, too, will be presented. They will reach from this locality alone many hundreds of thousands of dollars—all of them, too, for supplies to the Union army."

The evidence on this and kindred topics is overwhelming. But to return to Andersonville, what follows will bear careful perusal:

A PRISONER'S NARRATIVE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 29, 1865.

COLONEL EMERIC ZABAD, late A. D. C., Third Army Corps.

COLONEL :

* * * * *

You desire a history of my prison life while in the so-called Confederate States. I did not intend that such misery should be-

come manifest to the world ; the dictates of humanity should cast the veil of oblivion over those days of suffering, cold, hunger, and want, but as you wish it I give a few of the incidents. I fear you will find me but a poor chronicler of those days of mortal misery, awful and premeditated persecution.

About three o'clock on the morning of the 27th of November, 1863, I was captured at Brandy station, Virginia, by the notorious Mosby. He was accompanied by over one hundred of his gang, all dressed alike in our uniform. I was robbed of six months' pay which I received the day before.

* * * * *

We reached Richmond, Virginia, on Sunday, 29th November, where our misery commenced. At the Libby prison we (twenty-six prisoners) were stripped of our clothing, and underwent a rigid search. Over five hundred dollars were taken from my fellow prisoners, after which our clothing was restored, and in our worn-out and destitute condition we were consigned to Pemberton prison, opposite Libby.

For the first fortnight we lived tolerably well, thanks to the sanitary commissioners who supplied pork and hard tack (biscuits.) We were then informed that the supply was out, and we had, therefore, *volens nolens*, to subsist on prison fare—a small piece of corn bread daily, alternately receiving in addition some filthy, sour, and unpalatable brown soup.

I had not changed my shirt during the three months while at Richmond, and we had no soap.

About one o'clock on the morning of the 22d February, 1864, four hundred of us prisoners left Richmond, each receiving a loaf of half baked bread.

We reached Andersonville, Georgia, on the 29th February ; some of our party died on the road, and we were turned into that celebrated stockade like so many cattle put into a pound.

On our journey to Andersonville we never received more than three coarse biscuits per diem ; no meat, and we had to stand up in the (freight) carriages the entire journey, occasionally being turned into a field to stretch our wearied limbs whenever the train ran off the track.

There was no preparation made for us at our destination ; the stockade was not provided with either shed or shelter in any shape or form, and we had to shift for ourselves as best we could. There were not two thousand prisoners confined there at this time. Two cooking utensils only were allowed to every ninety men, and each one had to wait his turn to cook his little ration of corn meal and bacon. I have often had my breakfast, in consequence, so late as ten o'clock at night.

Captain Wirz commanded the prison, than whom does not exist a more despotic and desperate tyrant, and for the most trivial offense, real or supposed, he would stop our entire rations for the day. I have often had, in consequence, to fast for thirty-six hours at a time.

In July there were

THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND PRISONERS

in the stockade, which was then only enlarged by ten acres, making in all twenty-six acres, including seven acres of swamp. The swamp was converted into a black, muddy soil by the deposit of human excrement; it was literally a moving mass of maggots. The exhalation from it was truly awful.

I have seen many men shot at by the guards. It was not unusual for me to see, when I went daily to fetch water from a course which ran through the swamp, the sentry with his gun at the ready to shoot down the first man who ventured to lay his hand on the rail of the dead line; and I have seen them aim, fire, and kill. I shall never forget seeing the heart's blood of a prisoner (he had but recently arrived) crimson that stream. It was no unusual nightly occurrence to hear five or six shots fired, nor the like number during the day. Numbers were shot down in this manner.

During the months of June and July, 1864, I have seen many men

FALL DOWN AND DIE ABOUT

the camp, and also in the swamp; and during the month of May, before the hospitals (as they were called) were removed outside of the stockade, many weak and sickly patients fell into the sinks which were provided for their accommodation by their fellow prisoners, and smothered in the filth before assistance could be rendered.

The food we received was wholly insufficient, and it was equally repugnant. We suffered bad treatment at the hands of some of our fellow prisoners, desperadoes from the army and navy; men were coolly and deliberately robbed and murdered at night by these parties. Lynch law was enacted, and I saw six of these malefactors strung up together and hanged within the stockade.

I was paroled in August last, and assigned to duty in the office of Surgeon Isaiah White, where I succeeded Dorrance Atwater in keeping the official record of our dead.

I believe the late General Winder did not take command at Andersonville until the month of May, 1864, when he had those formidable fortifications and batteries erected

OVERAWING THE PRISON.

I have seen the General very often. Captain Wirz called upon him daily on official matters, but independent of any instructions he might have received from the General the

man himself was equal to any emergency, any brutality that the Devil might prompt him to, or the monster's own bad heart might suggest.

The innumerable and indescribable diseases occurring among the prisoners were caused principally through want of proper food and cleanliness, combined with harsh and unmitigated cruelty.

I am aware that reports went forward to Richmond stating that the inclosure (the stockade) was quite inadequate to afford accommodation for one-third of the prisoners, and that the food was not alone improper but insufficient in quantity; and I have heard that the callous and heartless answer received from Richmond to such and the like remonstrances was that if more prisoners arrived to "cram them in."

* * * * *

Chief Surgeon White, Surgeons Stevenson, Hearndon, and Rowsie did everything in their power that professional skill could devise or humanity dictate to provide for the sick, as well in the hospital as in the stockade, where the daily mortality was equal; but in the face of insuperable obstacles and barriers, and

IN THE ABSENCE OF PROPER MEDICINES, save those indigenous to the soil, what could they do to obviate their suffering, or prevent the awful daily mortality.

I subjoin the particulars of the mortality which occurred at Andersonville, Georgia, from the opening of the stockade, February 24, to November 15, 1864. They are authentic, and may be relied upon. I copied them from the official books kept at Andersonville.

I was released at Savannah, Georgia, November 20, 1864.

Of the four hundred prisoners who left Richmond with me I venture to say fifty are not now alive to indorse my statement.

1864.	Deaths.
March.....	283
April.....	576
May.....	708
June.....	1,201
July.....	1,952
August.....	2,992
September.....	3,217
October to 15th November, 1864.....	1,151

Total..... 12,080

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

THOMAS WALLSH,

Late of Company F, 74th New York Volunteers.

A PRISON DIARY.

The following extracts are copied from the Testament kept by Thomas Wallsh while a prisoner of war :

1863.

Nov. 27. Captured by Mosby at Brandy station, Virginia, three o'clock, A. M.

Nov. 28. Arrived at Gordonsville.

Nov. 29. Arrived at Richmond.

1864.

Feb. 9. One hundred and nine officers escaped from confinement in Libby. It is said Colonel Straight also escaped.

Feb. 17. First batch, four hundred prisoners, left for Andersonville.

Feb. 18. Second batch four hundred prisoners.

Feb. 21. Third batch four hundred prisoners. Changed our prison quarters from Pemberton to Crew's, next adjoining. Two hundred prisoners from Belle Island joined us. They give a terrible account of that place. We expect to leave for Georgia to-morrow.

Feb. 22. Monday. Left Richmond at an early hour this morning; each prisoner received a loaf of corn bread; it was only half baked. I was very ill during the day; we traveled during the entire day and night; had to stand up during the journey. Fifty prisoners were crammed into each carriage.

Feb. 23. The train ran off the track within one mile of Raleigh, North Carolina, left the cars about five miles west of Raleigh, and camped in the woods. The guards here were kind to us. Eight small biscuits for a day's ration.

Feb. 24. Left Raleigh; received eight biscuits.

Feb. 25. Charlotte; cars again ran off the track; received two crackers (for twenty-four hours) rations.

Feb. 26. Received a corn-dodger; a piece of cooked beef about the size of a dollar piece; night cold.

Feb. 27. Intensely cold; embarked on trucks; left Charlotte; six poor fellows interred here; about three P. M., arrived at Columbia; changed trucks for cars; colored people offered cakes and pies for sale; guards drove them away.

Feb. 28. Traveled all night, and arrived ten o'clock Sunday morning at Augusta, Georgia, and received two biscuits each. There was a good deal of excitement here, young boys and old men were being drilled. On leaving this place we were served out with to-morrow's rations, six crackers and two slices of bacon.

Feb. 29. At two o'clock arrived at our destination, Camp Sumter, Andersonville, Georgia, and received two crackers. The prison contains sixteen acres of ground, but the inclosure is not yet completed. The change from Richmond appears to be a decided improvement. The place is simply a pound on an extensive scale. No shelter

whatever to keep us from the inclemency of the weather.

In Georgia State, in rebeledom, there stands, Amidst pestilential air and swampy lands, A prison—a place more fit for Southern dogs Who raised its lofty walls of pine wood logs.

Mr. Wallsh makes reference to Dorrence Atwater, now United States consul at Tahiti. Fortunately this gentleman has not only preserved an authentic record, but he is himself now on his way home upon leave, and will be able to testify in person to the facts, of the brutal details of which he had abundant opportunity of knowing. Mr. Atwater published, it will be remembered, a list of Union soldiers who died at Andersonville, Georgia, and was afterward with Miss Clara Barton, the noble American woman whose patriotic services in our war, and afterward to a common humanity during the Franco-Prussian contest, entitle her to as undying fame as that which clusters about the name of Florence Nightingale, occupied in arranging and naming the graves in the national cemetery at Andersonville.

Mr. Atwater says, in a preface to the list referred to, that he was taken prisoner July 7, 1863, and five months after sent from Belle Isle to Andersonville, where in May, 1864, he was paroled and detailed in Surgeon White's office. He kept the record of daily mortality, and also made monthly and quarterly abstracts of the deaths.

"The latter one," he writes, "was said to be for the Federal Government, which" he learned afterwards, "was never received."

"THE APPALLING MORTALITY"

continues Mr. Atwater, "was such that I suspected that it was the design of the rebel Government to kill and maim our prisoners by exposure and starvation so that they would forever be totally unfit for military service, and that they withheld these facts."

Mr. Atwater determined, therefore, to obtain and keep a list of the dead, which he did, beginning to copy in August, in 1864, and bringing it with him safely through the lines in March, 1865. These rolls were used to verify and correct the lists and books afterward captured at Andersonville by General Wilson.

MISS CLARA BARTON, in the same publication, published her report of the expedition made to the prison-

pen, in order to clear the grounds for cemetery purposes, and to identify the graves of our dead. Her graphic pen gives a painful description of the scenes as they appeared in July, 1865, three months after surrender. She says:

"We are wont to attribute their (the captives) chief suffering to insufficiency of food, and while this is probably just, still, to the mind of one who has looked over the scanty, shelterless, pitiful spot of earth to which they were confined, and taken into consideration the numberless trials which must have grown out of the privation of space and the necessary conveniences of life, the conviction will force itself that these latter woes fell but little short of the former. *It is to be remembered that during thirteen long months they knew neither shelter nor protection from the changeable skies above nor the pitiless, unfeeling earth beneath.*"

* * * "Think of thirty thousand men penned by close stockade, upon twenty-six acres of ground from which every tree and shrub had been uprooted for fuel to cook their scanty food, huddled, like cattle, without shelter or blanket, half-clad and hungry, with the dreary night setting in after a day of autumn rain. The hill-tops would not hold them all; the valley was filled with the swollen brook; seventeen feet from the stockade run the fatal dead line beyond which no man might step and live. * * *

But this is only one feature of their suffering; and perhaps the lightest. Of the long, dazzling months when gaunt famine stalked at noonday, and pestilence walked at night, * * * I will not trust myself to speak; I scarce dare think. * * * But after this, whenever any man who has lain a prisoner within the stockade of Andersonville would tell you of his sufferings, how he fainted, scorched, drenched, hungered, sickened, was scoffed, scourged, hunted, persecuted, though the tale be long and twice-told, as you would have your own wrongs appreciated, your own woes pitied, your own cries for mercy heard, I charge you, listen and believe him. *However definitely he may have spoken know he has not told you all. However strongly he may have outlined, or deeply he may have colored his picture, know that the reality calls for a better light and a nearer view than your clouded, distant gaze will ever get.*"

The earnest and pathetic appeal of the noble woman who wrote the foregoing is not likely to be unheeded, especially when the diabolism which planned and maintained such unnecessary misery and cruelty, dares to flaunt its brazen denials in the face of the still living survivors thereof. There can be

no question of the deliberate character of the atrocious cruelty that was systematically practiced, nor of the other appalling fact, that such cruelty was approved and carried out under the orders of the President of the Slaveholders' Confederacy.

For a lack of medical supplies there may be some excuse. For an insufficiency of food even, at times, there might be undesigned reasons. But for the deliberate brutality which denuded the stockade inclosure of all shelter, even to a tree, and which prevented the erection of even the poorest apologies for protection from the sun and rains, there cannot be the slightest excuse presented. The responsibility of Jefferson Davis for this is proven by his adverse indorsements on the reports of the Inspector General, and by his continued marks of favor to the brutal General Winder, following close after the conduct of that person was made known by Col. Chandler and other reputable witnesses, to the rebel war department. The finger of history and the voice of mankind will emphasize the verdict against Mr. Davis.

Surmounting that Hill.

The following brief but spirited dialogue is reported as occurring between Honorable B. H. Hill, of Georgia, and General M. M. Bane, of Illinois. The latter is a well-known Radical Republican, and was a very gallant officer of the Union army. Of Mr. Hill it is unnecessary to speak. The Union surmounted that Hill from 1861 to 1865, and it is not likely to long remain an obstacle. Some friend introduced the two gentlemen as Radicals of opposite schools. Mr. Hill soon declared, as they talked, that "this idea of equality and universal suffrage will ruin the Republic."

Bane told him:

"Sir, we have put it in the Constitution, and sealed it with our blood, and, sir, it shall be kept there, and if we can't keep it there with you in Congress, we'll put you out again."

The spirit of both sections spoke in these few words. But while there is no doubt that Mr. Hill would be "put out" if necessary, it is equally as certain there will be no occasion.

TOOMBS AND THE SCALAWAG.

BY A SOUTHERN REPUBLICAN.

"The worst of all things the world ever saw, the Scalawag, the consummation of all villainy."—Extract from the speech of Robert Toombs delivered in the Representative Hall at the Capitol of Georgia, on the night of the 25th of January, 1876.

Many Democrats, apparently shocked by the fiery and vehement utterances of their distinguished leader on the occasion alluded to, attempt to explain and palliate their effect upon the civilized world as being but the rapid mouthings of an old man in his dotage.

Seeing no other excuse for such utterances on such an occasion by so distinguished an orator, they affect to pretend that it may be truly said of Mr. Toombs, now, "*stat magni nominis umbra*" exhibiting only a faint image of his former greatness.

A due regard for the truth of history requires that the fallacy of this statement be exposed.

Mr. Toombs to-day deservedly stands in the front rank of his profession as one of the safest counsellors and most eloquent and efficient advocates at the Bar. And it may well be questioned whether any one, holding this position, truthfully, can be said to be in his dotage.

Again, it is well known, that, prior to this speech of Mr. Toombs, the calling of a constitutional convention of the people of Georgia, while it had been agitated to a very limited extent, in a few localities, had never been considered a politic or feasible meas-

ure by the mass of the Democratic party of that State.

But in less than one week after Mr. Toombs made the speech quoted from above, in which he peremptorily demanded of the Legislature that it should take the necessary action to allow the will of the people of Georgia (the Democratic party according to Mr. Toombs constituting the only true people) to be heard on the question of a convention, a bill calling a convention was passed in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority.

Can it, then, be truthfully said that a man is in his dotage, or that his political influence and power is even waning, when the influence of his eloquence upon the minds of his constituents is such as, in one short week, to effect an entire change of views of the popular branch of the Georgia Democratic Legislature upon a question so momentous as that of calling a convention of the people of the State, for the purpose of changing the constitution, the organic law.

And does not the attempt of the apologists for the Toombs, to explain away the evil of his speech by attributing his unfortunate utterances to his dotage, come with a bad grace from men, most of whom, upon a comparison with Mr. Toombs for strength and keenness of intellect, would appear like farthing rush-lights beside noonday sun.

Evidently, Senator Gordon, one of the most prudent and sagacious of all the Confederate leaders in the South, does not consider Mr. Toombs in his dotage, or as wanting influence, for we find him availing himself of the earliest opportunity afforded him to deliver an address to his constituents deploring the effect of Mr. Toombs speech upon the minds of the thinking men of the North, and counseling them to do all in their power to counteract the effect of that speech as soon as possible.

Let, then, no true friend of American constitutional liberty, as proclaimed in the platform of the National Union Republican party, cherish the delusion that Mr. Toombs, who has ever been one of the ablest and most

[EDITORIAL NOTE.—This article so clearly and moderately sets forth a certain view of the political situation, as entertained by those whom the writer ably represents, that its value cannot be questioned, even though there can be no doubt to those who, like THE REPUBLICAN, endeavor to look at all things in their national and not their local aspects, that the severe censure the writer makes on Northern Republican hostility or indifference to the "native" Southern Republican sentiment is almost wholly overdrawn and without foundation. The most virulent criticisms in Northern newspapers and the most pronounced coldness exhibited by Republicans North, has been towards the Northern-born citizens of the South who are termed "carpet-baggers," or to the active colored politicians, and not at all towards those who, having served in the rebellion have since in many honesty accepted "the situation." It is difficult for our Southern-born friends to entirely understand the absence of sectional pride or way of looking at affairs, which is a marked characteristic of the loyal States.]

bitter of its foes, is in his dotage, and incapable of further effective service in the ranks of the opposition, for it must be admitted that he is to-day as strong mentally and politically as in the palmiest days of the rebellion.

When such a distinguished luminary of the Democracy finds it necessary on such an occasion to pour out upon the devoted head of the "scalawag" the choicest vials of his fiercest wrath, it may be of public interest to inquire who is the scalawag and why he incurs Mr. Toombs deepest displeasure, so deep in fact that to accommodate the full measure of his hate, to use his own language, "a deeper pit in hell must be dug for him."

First, then, who is the scalawag? In common Democratic parlance in the South, every white, whether native-born Southerner or born at the North, or elsewhere, and who had, prior to the breaking out of the late rebellion, become a citizen of one of the Southern States, who dares to advocate and vote for the principles and candidates of the National Union Republican party, is called a scalawag. No man knows better than Mr. Toombs the full meaning and scope of every word he utters—and these, then, are the men he so bitterly denounces as low dirty fellows and traitors alike to their race and section.

Observe that every Republican voter in the South does not incur this odious character and the direst displeasure of Mr. Toombs and others of the Bourbon Democracy. For Mr. Toombs in his late speech tells the colored Republican voters that he can respect them, notwithstanding in the same speech he calls them "beasts." He also in the same speech with like charity proclaims to the "carpet-baggers" that he can forgive them, for their morality is loose and he never expected any better of them.

Having thus clearly and unmistakably identified the scalawag it remains to inquire:

Second, Why the scalawag as thus defined should thus incur the vituperation and abuse of this distinguished leader of the Bourbon Democracy of the South?

When the veterans of the Union and Confederate armies met at Appomattox Court-House on the memorable 9th of April, 1865, General Grant, the great warrior who had led the Union armies over so many hotly con-

tested battle-fields to final victory and triumph, in that supreme hour of the nation's crisis realized the fact that the blood and treasure which had flowed so freely in the Union cause, in order to accomplish its perfect work and reach its full fruition in the blessings of heaven, must have been offered as a sacrifice, not to sectional hate or triumph, but to the full and perfect reconstruction of that Union which had been so sadly and so terribly jarred by the rude shocks of a rebellious war.

From that memorable day on which, with a delicacy of sentiment and a nobility of soul that will render his name immortal, he returned to his distinguished antagonist his sword, his every public act and utterance has given the world assurance that whatever may be the opinion of others as to the object and results of the late war, for him they meant the indissoluble Union of indestructible States and the supremacy of that Union and the laws thereof over all other political organizations and combinations whatsoever. In short, a government of the people, by the people, for the people, of the whole American nation.

He has never given the slightest intimation that he ever regarded that portion of our country comprising the States lately in rebellion as a conquered province wrested from a foreign power, but, on the contrary, has never seemed to forget that it was the land of his own misguided countrymen, who had made a gallant and heroic though unsuccessful struggle for a cause they believed to be right.

Thoroughly national himself in all his views and sentiments he realized the fact that the struggle having ended, it was the best generalship and highest statesmanship under the circumstances to inspire his late antagonists with like feelings in regard to the supremacy of the nation and its laws.

His political sagacity disclosed to him the fact, however slow others have appeared to be in realizing it, that if the Union was ever again to be restored to perfect symmetry and power the citizens and inhabitants of the States lately in rebellion would have to take a cordial and active part in the work of reconstruction, or, failing in that, the Union would be a union but in name, held together

by force. And his instantaneous comprehension of this great political truth, which so many distinguished men whose ability as statesmen and devotion to the Union cannot be questioned have seemed so slow to comprehend, will forever stamp him as being as great in peace as in war, with few equals and no superior. That his policy will ultimately triumph is certain. That it has been so long in abeyance is not to be wondered at when it is remembered that some extreme men at the North opposed it upon the ground that all the people of the South who had participated actively in the rebellion were traitors who had forfeited their lives, to say nothing of their political rights, and should never again be allowed to participate in the public affairs of either the States or the Nation, while many extreme men of the South opposed it upon the ground that a State having the right under the Constitution to secede, the States remaining in the Union had no right under the Constitution to coerce the seceding States back into the Union, and that the South having been overpowered by superior force should bide her time, and, like all nations conquered by a foreign power, avail herself of the first opportunity of throwing off the yoke.

To these extreme men of either section the idea of a reconstructed Union with ex-rebels participating freely and cordially in the government of either State or Nation is alike odious. Hating each other, they hate every one who attempts to bring them together in social or political contact. These are the men who make a common fight against the "scalawag." They alike affect to doubt the sincerity of the "scalawags'" devotion to the Union and its laws. Alike they both profess to doubt the sincerity of his professions of devotion to the Union and its government, upon the ground that he is a Southerner and has been a rebel. Accordingly these extremists unite in proclaiming to the world that no respectable ex-rebels in the South are Republicans, and that the white men of the South claiming to be Republicans are low ignorant fellows and mercenary traitors.

According to their statements the only true and reliable friends the Union and National Government, and especially the Republican

party, have in the South, are the men who have moved South since the war, and the colored people, or as Mr. Toombs calls them, the "carpet-baggers," and "beasts."

Now, the truth of history requires that these slanders on the ex-rebel Republicans of the South be repelled.

It should be borne in mind that the bitter and unrelenting warfare waged against the "scalawags" of the South is not so much on account of their willingness to have the Union restored as it is because they are willing and actually do participate in the efforts made to restore the Union upon the wise and just and humane principles of the National Republican party. For it is true that an ex-rebel may make Union speeches and take any number of oaths to support the Constitution and laws of the United States; nay, may even be a member of the National Legislature and yet retain his decency and respectability provided he does so as a Democrat and is bitter in denouncing Republican measures and men.

But when an ex-rebel makes Union speeches, or votes, or holds office as a Republican, forthwith, according to Mr. Toombs, *et id omni genus*, he ceases to be a gentleman or a patriot and becomes that "consummation of all villainy"—the scalawag. How can this be better illustrated than by comparison of the public career of Messrs. Gordon and Hill as Democrats, with that of Messrs. Longstreet and Akerman as Republicans, since the work of reconstruction commenced.

Each of these distinguished Southerners cast his fortunes with the Southern Confederacy and participated actively in the rebellion. After the war ended, diversity in the political views of these ex-rebels aligned General Gordon and Mr. Hill with the Democratic party, and General Longstreet and Mr. Akerman with the Republican party.

Messrs. Akerman and Longstreet have both held office under the Federal Government as Republicans, and for so doing have received an amount and quality of abuse from the Democratic press and politicians of the South unsurpassed in the annals of political warfare.

Messrs. Hill and Gordon are now filling Federal positions as Democrats, and yet the English language is exhausted in heaping

compliments upon them by the Democratic press and politicians of the South.

Now, Mr. Toombs and Mr. Hill both realized the fact, early in the history of reconstruction that if the Union was ever to be firmly restored upon the wise, just, and humane principles of the Republican party that the ex-rebels of the South must of necessity co-operate cordially in the work of reconstruction, and both of them being bitterly opposed to the firm reconstruction of the Union upon any such basis determined to prevent it if within their power.

Accordingly as early as the summer of 1868, Mr. Toombs and Mr. Hill addressed a mass-meeting of the Southern Democracy in Atlanta, Georgia, on the subject of reconstruction.

Mr. Hill, one of the most eloquent and effective advocates in the South as well as a most subtle and ingenious politician, sounded the key-note of that warfare which was intended to prevent the ex-rebels of the South from participating actively in the work of reconstruction upon the principles of the Republican party, in a speech advising ostracism of every kind against the white man who should dare to advocate the principles of that party in the South. In that speech he is reported to have said, among other things: "I tell you, my friends, there is no peace for this country until Radicalism is crushed; not only crushed but despised; not only despised but made infamous." And Mr. Toombs made a similar bitter speech.

How well that cry was taken up by the lesser lights of the Bourbon Democracy, and what suffering and misery has been entailed upon the Republicans of the South in consequence thereof, would require volumes to depict.

Suffice it to say that thousands of ex-rebels who, prior to these memorable speeches of Messrs. Toombs and Hill, were sympathizing and acting with the Republicans, shrank back appalled into the ranks of the Democracy, so frightened and dazed by the lightning flashes of Mr. Hill's keen sarcasm and the satire and the deep thunder of Mr. Toombs' denunciations that they were stricken with "day blindness" so as to be unable to recognize a Republican on the street by daylight for years afterwards. And the persistent and unscrupulous mis-

representations of the Democratic press of the South concerning the character and standing of such ex-rebels as dared to assert their manhood by boldly proclaiming their principles and acting with the Republican party have created doubts as to the character and motives of these ex-rebel Republicans even in the minds of some of their Republican friends at the North.

And thus suspected and distrusted by their Northern Republican allies and persecuted and abused by the Southern Bourbon Democracy, these ex-rebel Republicans of the South have suffered this crucifixion of the soul for years, through a perfect storm of hate, unflinchingly. True and steadfast in their devotion to the principles of the National Union Republican party, neither ostracism in all its forms, nor defamation, nor intimidation, nor terrorism of any kind, and not even the unkind suspicions and distrust engendered in the minds of their Republican friends North by the willfull and persistent misrepresentations of an unscrupulous opposition press, have ever been able to force them to desert or even waver in their support of the grand and immortal principles of the Republican party.

And thus the secret of the bitter hostility of Mr. Toombs to the "scalawag" is fully explained.

PRESENTS TO EASTERN NATIONS.—The custom of presenting gifts to the officials of certain countries, especially those of the East, at the conclusion of important treaties has been followed by our Government and those of Europe from time immemorial. The practice is an ancient one, and appears to be but another form for the expression of close friendship and esteem among the contracting parties. The United States follows the time-honored custom in its treaties with the Indians. Whether the policy is a wise one or not, it has been sanctioned by every administration from that of Washington to that of President Grant. Yet in the face of Democratic precedents, Springer, from Illinois, selects an isolated case in which certain Turkish officials were presented with gifts by our Government at the conclusion of a treaty between the two nations. Springer would have the people believe that the thing was never heard of before; that it remained for a Republican administration to inaugurate this system of foreign extravagance. Partisanship has blinded Mr. Springer to the truth. To deceive the people by presenting certain facts, and withholding others of greater importance, is to him a party obligation, and he has endeavored to faithfully carry it out.

MINERAL WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

In collecting material for an exhibition of our mineral wealth special care has been taken to embody the largest practicable amount of information in the least possible space. Research has been confined chiefly to coal, petroleum, iron, copper, silver, and gold. These, from their great pecuniary value and direct connection with national progress, are among the most important elements of prosperity.

T. S. Hunt, Esq., of Boston, in a recent very interesting paper on the development of mineral resources, divides the country by a supposed line drawn north and south at the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains. To the Atlantic side he assigns "a great basin of paleozoic strata;" or more particularly designates it as "the vast appalachian coal-field, with its dependent areas of semi-bituminous and anthracite coal." Here, also, is found, "iron, copper, lead, salt, and petroleum." The Pacific half contains the more precious metals, "gold and silver among the chief products."

Acknowledging the convenience of this division the better to comprehend the subject, yet it is certain there are immense deposits of coal and petroleum already developed, of very fine quality, in the western slope. The coal, perhaps, does not reach the standard of anthracite, but it equals, and much of it is superior to that procured from the States immediately west of the Mississippi river; while the oil, so far as discovered, is fully up to that of Pennsylvania.

COAL.

Coal being among the earliest mining interests, and its proportions having reached such an extent, the aggregate valuation exceeding all other minerals combined, we shall treat it in point of prominence first.

The commercial magnitude this article of domestic and manufacturing importance has achieved is largely owing to a thorough knowledge in producing it, the multiplied applications for its uses, and a more general comprehension of its resources. Besides, a much larger experience has been had in its investigation and study than that yet acquired or given to the separating of gold and

silver from the flint-quartz in the deep lodes and gorges of the west; and much less capital is required in a successful conducting of the enterprise. The work of the former covers a period of not less than one hundred and twenty-six years, while that of the latter comprises little more than a quarter of a century.

The first coal mined for mineral fuel was by the Colonies, from the Richmond, Virginia, mines, south of the Blue Ridge. It was, however, of a low grade, but produced in considerable quantity, and after the Revolution sold quite extensively in eastern cities. For many years these mines were operated with more or less profit, but now are worked only for home consumption.

The great central field of bituminous coal lies buried in the mountains of western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, West Virginia, and northern portions of Kentucky, having an area estimated at 58,000 square miles.

Adjoining this on the east, still in Pennsylvania, and extending into Maryland, are small areas of semi-bituminous deposits, among which may be mentioned the Blossburg, Cumberland, Broad Top, Johnstown, Towanda, and Ralston. These combined, yield about 5,000,000 tons annually.

The total production of bituminous coal from Pennsylvania mines alone, for the year 1872, was 7,442,000 tons, and of semi-bituminous, 3,000,000. Those of Ohio for the same period were 4,400,000 tons.

Anthracite coal the past few years has taken the lead, but was a long time working itself into favor. Its advantages, however, are now fully appreciated, and it ranks first among consumers, either for domestic use or for other purposes. The small region in eastern Pennsylvania where the great bulk of this coal is obtained, having an area of not more than 472 square miles, in 1872 produced 21,500,000 tons.

In Montgomery county, Virginia, there is found semi-bituminous and even anthracite coals of good quality, but the extent of deposit has never been thoroughly investigated.

Rhode Island and Massachusetts have an area of 500 square miles of the better grade

of coal, including anthracite; but with the exception of one mine at Portsmouth, which in 1872 yielded 14,000 tons, this vast field is waiting proper development to make it productive and valuable.

The State of Michigan has an area of about 6,700 square miles of coal; but it is thin, of inferior quality, and mined chiefly for home purposes. In 1872 the estimated production of this State was 30,000 tons.

Illinois coal field covers a great portion of the State extending into Indiana and Kentucky, reaches some 47,000 square miles, and in 1872 produced—Illinois 3,000,000, Indiana 800,000; Kentucky 300,000 tons.

Tennessee and Alabama have developed important areas of bituminous coal, pronounced of medium quality; while the coals of Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas are of a much lower grade. In Arkansas, however, there has been discovered beds of superior semi-bituminous coal, with a near approach to anthracite.

The Mount Vernon mine in Mendocino county, California, so far as developed, extends under about 7,200 acres of land, and is a very good article of bituminous coal. The supply is estimated to be large, and needs but the conveniences of transportation to make it important and profitable.

Mr. L. Falkenau, State assayer, has made an analysis of this coal, which we annex :

Specific gravity.....	1.282
Volatile combustible substance.....	46.20 per cent.
Fixed carbon.....	49.70 "
Moisture.....	6.70 "
Ashes.....	3.00 "
Sulphur.....	0.40 "

Amount of gas evolved, 37 cubic feet per ten pounds avoirdupois of coal.

The canon coal-field of Colorado yielded in 1873, 12,909 tons; and in 1874, 19,385 tons. This, however, is not as good coal as that of the Mount Vernon mine in California.

Pancake Mountain coal probably is the most promising vein of this mineral yet discovered in the Pacific slope. This mine is in Nevada, and believed to be the first true coal found west of the Rocky Mountains. This vein is said to belong to the carboniferous age, and the deposit thought to be extensive. The present product is about 100 tons a month, and sells for \$12 to \$20 per ton on the dump.

There are two important coal-fields in Utah, one at Castle Valley, the other at San Pete. Both of these are considered rich in deposit, and the mineral a good bituminous grade. We have no figures that are reliable in connection with the products of these mines.

Macfarlane, the very best authority, sums up the grand total of this wealth in the United States, for the year 1873, at 50,000,000 tons; while the *Engineering and Mining Journal*, published in New York, makes the following announcement as the total production for 1874:

Anthracite coal.....	24,281,471 tons,
Bituminous ".....	25,248,684 "
Lignite ".....	1,217,020 "
Total.....	50,747,175 "

PETROLEUM.

Without entering into any particulars of history touching this mineral, we shall simply state that the oil wells of Pennsylvania were opened in 1859, producing the first year 500,000 barrels of crude oil, which sold at 55 cents per gallon. Much excitement followed this discovery, and for the ten ensuing years the production amounted in the gross to 35,273,000 barrels of 40 gallons each, and there were in 1870 3,000 wells in operation.

In 1861 the exports of this mineral were 28,000 barrels, and for the ten years following it amounted to 14,465,000 barrels. The average price of this oil had fallen to 25 cents per gallon, but even this made the aggregate valuation \$144,000,000.

Exportations for 1870 were 3,495,800 barrels; for 1872, 3,754,060 barrels; for 1873, 5,937,041 barrels, and for 1874, 5,878,578 barrels, being a slight falling off from the previous year. The amount, however, for 1874, chiefly refined oil, at the mean price of 13.09 cents per gallon, gave a total valuation for the year of \$30,825,268.

The total estimated production of crude oil for 1874 was 29,282 barrels daily, equal to 10,687,930 barrels for the year.

IRON.

The iron interest of the United States has received a good share of public attention, and its resources have been largely developed.

Supplies of this metal, in more or less quantities, and of higher or lower degrees of

excellencies, have been obtained from Vermont, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; from Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Alabama; from Lake Superior, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia, with Missouri and Arkansas. In fact, the whole eastern half of the country is studded with immense beds of this valuable ore.

The total amount of iron produced in the United States in 1819 has been set down at 54,000 tons, against 165,000 tons in 1830. Then in 1840 it was 347,000 tons, against 600,000 tons in 1850; and in 1860 it was 919,870 tons, to 1,865,434 tons in 1870. In 1872 the grand total of iron production reached its highest figures—2,880,070 tons.

COPPER.

Throughout the eastern border of the great coal areas, embedded in the crystalline rocks, are considerable deposits of this mineral. It has been mined and treated to some extent in Vermont, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Eastern Tennessee. The total production, however, from all these sources has never exceeded 2,500 tons.

Lake Superior is the famous field for this metal. Here the ore is obtained in a state of comparative purity, requiring simply a mechanical process to separate it from the rock, when it is at once prepared for melting into solid ingots of copper.

These mines from 1845 (date of last opening) to 1858 yielded 18,000 tons. In 1873 it was 18,514 tons. There were thus 514 tons more taken out in the one year—1873—than for the thirteen preceding years. In 1874 there were 22,235 tons of ore mined, 83 per cent of which was copper, while the aggregate for the twenty-nine years since commencing operations was 217,134 tons.

Mr. Caswell places the production of this mineral, from Lake Superior alone, for 1874, at 17,327 tons direct, and from other ores 2,375 tons, with a grand total of 19,702 tons of ingot copper, and the exports for the same period were 4,500 tons.

We have omitted any reference to the ores of chrome, zinc, and nickel, now quite largely mined, or to the extensive salt deposits of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia. These works now

supply the markets of the country with this mineral, and yield no inconsiderable amount of exports. There is also granite, marble, sandstones, and roofing slate, all objects of substantial industry. But leaving the eastern half of our territory thus imperfectly represented, we turn to the west.

QUICKSILVER.

The recent scarcity, and consequent high price of this mineral has given a sudden and wonderful impetus to its production. For the past year the quicksilver excitement has been general throughout California. The easy accessibility of the mines, the broad area of country where they are located, and the profit derived from comparatively small investments, have induced large numbers to engage in the enterprise. As nearly as can be ascertained, there are forty-seven producing mines in the State, and a large number of claims giving promise of valuable developments.

A very large per cent. of this metal is consumed in the mining States and Territories west of the Rocky Mountains, and not even an approximation can be made of the aggregate production.

R. W. Raymond, however, reports for 1874 432,635 pounds of quicksilver as having been shipped "through freight" from San Francisco by the Central Pacific Railroad; 36,444 pounds from San Jose, and 47,000 pounds as "local freight." The exports by sea from 1859 to 1874, inclusive, were 365,788 flasks, valued at \$14,226,411.

GOLD AND SILVER.

From among the vast number of producing mines in the State of California we have selected thirteen for special notice, either of which yield over \$100,000 annually. The most prominent of these is the

IDAHO.

This is near Grass Valley, Nevada county, owned by a corporation, and worked by a 90-horse power engine. The length of location is 3,100 feet, average width of ledge $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet, length of drifts 3,988 feet, depth of working shaft 920 feet, and has 8 levels. There are 35 stamps, and the mine is in a most prosperous condition.

Mr. Edward Coleman, president and superintendent of the company, makes the fol-

lowing condensed report for the year ending December 7, 1874:

"During the year we have crushed 28,801½ tons of rock, of which 1,942½ tons came from the 400 level; 1,886½ tons came from the 500 level; 5,581½ tons came from the 600 level; 16,433½ tons came from the 700 level; 1,594½ tons came from the 800 level, and 963 tons from the shaft. This gave a gross yield of 36,169 ounces of gold, \$631,190.56; 217 tons of sulphurets, \$21,600; specimens, \$38.50; gross yield of tailings, \$10,989.25; gold from old copper, \$692.39; total, \$664,811.20."

This mine from 1869 to 1874 paid \$1,603,000 in dividends.

EUREKA.

This mine, situated about two miles east of Grass Valley, and adjoining the Idaho, has a location of 1,680 feet, and is worked by a 60-horse power through a shaft 1,250 feet deep. There are 8 levels, with a total length of drift 9,000 feet, and has a capacity of crushing 65 tons of ore daily. The mine is owned by a corporation, and commenced operations October 1, 1865. From that time to September 30, 1874, they had taken out \$4,273,148, and paid \$2,054,000 in dividends.

Mr. William Watts, superintendent, for the year ending September 30, 1874, reports 8,130 tons of ore "milled," with a production of \$205,780 in gold bullion.

EMPIRE.

This is also near Grass Valley, and like the others owned by a corporation. It has a depth of shaft 1,200 feet. There are 12 levels, and a drift of 7,900 feet. It is handled by steam power, and during the year worked 11,000 tons of ore with a product of \$187,000 in bullion.

PROVIDENCE.

This is owned by an incorporated company, and located within one and a quarter miles of Nevada City. It has 3,100 feet on a vein running north and south. Width of vein at 400 feet level is 10 to 12 feet. This is said to be very rich in gold, and though there are no authentic figures given for the last fiscal year, yet Mr. Raymond estimates the production in excess of \$100,000. This mine is operated by water power, and the ore treated by chlorination.

BLACK BEAR.

This mine is in Siskiyou county, in the

wild northern portion of California, near Oregon. The counties of Siskiyou and Klamath, with an area of 10,740 square miles, have a population of less than 9,000. The works of this company are the largest in the section, and yielded in 1874 \$211,797 in gold.

KLAMATH.

The Klamath mine is also in Siskiyou county, is owned by a company, and in 1874 crushed 15,385 tons of ore, with the result of \$200,000 in gold bullion.

PLUMAS EUREKA.

This is the principal quartz mine in the county of Plumas, and is owned in England. For the year 1874 the company produced \$243,949 in gold. This county, Mr. Raymond says, has not been very thoroughly "prospected," and he gives it as his opinion that the region is specially rich in precious metals, which will be more fully developed upon the completion of the wagon road now in process of construction from Oroville up the north fork of Feather river to Sierra Valley.

SIERRA BUTTES.

These works are in Sierra county, also owned by an English company, and conducted upon quite an extensive scale. The number of tons of ore extracted and treated during 1874 was 53,959 tons, yielding \$470,608.

SUMNER.

This mine is in Kern county, is chiefly owned by Honorable J. P. Jones and Messrs. Burke and Strong. The patents of this company cover 11,300 feet, and the quantity of ore worked in 1874 was 5,000 tons, with a product of \$200,000.

HITE'S COVE.

This is in Mariposa county. In 1870 it produced \$180,000; in 1874 \$160,000.

AMADOR CONSOLIDATED.

These works are in Amador county, east of San Joaquin Valley, in the northernmost tier of mountain counties. This region is particularly noted for its mineral wealth. There are in the county 9 mining ditches, in all 48 miles in length. There are 16 quartz mills, crushing from 80,000 to 100,000 tons of ore annually. The Amador Consolidated is the leading mine, and for 1874 treated 22,098 tons, with a profit of \$259,971 in gold bullion.

KEYSTONE CONSOLIDATED.

This, also, is in Amador county, and in 1874 worked 25,146 tons, with a yield of \$452,506.

CHARIOT.

This is the leading mine in San Diego county, and has a capacity of 18 tons daily. In 1874 2,500 tons were worked, and a bullion product effected of \$138,864.

Recapitulation of the Thirteen Principal Mines.

Names.	County.	Tons Worked	Bullion Product
Idaho	Nevada..	28,801½	\$664,811
Eureka	Nevada..	8,130	205,780
Empire	Nevada..	11,000	187,000
Providence	Nevada..	*7,200	100,000
Black Bear	Siskiyou.	10,949	211,797
Klamath	Siskiyou.	15,385	200,000
Plumas Eureka	Plumas..	25,021	243,950
Sierra Buttes	Sierra ..	53,959	470,608
Sumner	Kern....	5,000	200,000
Hite's Cove	Mariposa	4,000	160,000
Amador Com's'd	Amador..	22,068	239,971
Keystone	Amador..	25,146	452,507
Chariot	San Diego	2,500	138,864
Total			3,497,288

* Estimated.

As will be seen by the foregoing table, the annual yield of the thirteen principal mines was \$3,497,288, which is but a small per cent. of the aggregate mineral production of the State for 1874, which is put down at \$20,300,531.

NEVADA.

This, beyond doubt, is the richest mining district in the United States, and without entering into particulars touching the various prominent mines, we may almost declare the whole Territory one vast field of mineral wealth. Of the extent and valuation no approximation can be made. Mr. Raymond, in his seventh annual report to Congress from the Pacific coast, makes special mention of 390 different mines and mining interests with the most flattering indications of a rapid increase in number and richness of new discoveries.

The famous Comstock lode is by far the most productive yet developed.

The official report of this mine for 1874 was:

Gold dust and bullion.....	\$379,933
Silver bullion	30,954,602
Ores and base bullion.....	4,117,698
Total	35,452,233

IDAHO.

The aggregate mineral wealth of this Territory for 1874, represented by counties, was:

Owyhee county.....	\$900,000
Boise "	700,000
Alturas "	150,000
North Idaho and Lemhi counties..	250,000
Total	2,000,000

MONTANA.

The mining interests of this Territory are very much crippled in the absence of proper transportation. The distance to the nearest water conveyance, Carroll, on the Missouri river, is 225 miles, and it is 400 and 450 miles, respectively, to Franklin and Corinne on the railroad. This passage as yet is made by mules and ox teams. Still the mineral product of the Territory for 1874 was:

Gold shipped by express (mules)..	\$2,511,276
Silver (refined bars) " " "	16,766
Selected ores by other conveyances	474,000
Amount taken out by miners	842,680
Total	3,844,722

UTAH.

Mr. George J. Johnson, of Salt Lake City, makes the following statement of the mineral production of Utah for 1874, and Mr. Raymond has incorporated it in his annual report:

Gold dust.....	\$92,093
Silver bullion.....	803,442
Base bullion shipped out of the Territory	2,811,200
Ore shipped.....	660,960
Refining works.....	5,664

4,373,359

Deduct silver bullion shipped by the Germania, and included above, but extracted from Nevada lead..... 461,758

Total..... 3,911,601

COLORADO.

Theodore F. Van Wagenen, editor *Mining Review*, makes the estimate of mineral products of the Territory for 1874, and which Mr. Raymond also adopts, as follows:

Gold bullion (from smelting and amalgamation works).....	\$422,563
Silver bullion (from smelting and amalgamation works).....	1,983,207
Gold bullion (from stamp mills)...	1,297,425

Gold bullion (from Placer workings).....	382,500
Ore and matte (shipped out of Territory).....	1,192,815
Pig lead.....	73,676
Copper.....	100,197
Coal.....	1,600,000
Total	6,962,383

ARIZONA.

This Territory produced in 1874 (estimated) \$487,000 in gold and silver.

1874 AND 1875.

We have not made special mention of Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, or Wyoming, but incorporate them in the following general statements :

Total Production of Precious Metals for the Year 1874.

Arizona	\$487,000
California	20,300,531
Colorado	5,178,510
Idaho	1,880,004
Montana.....	3,844,722
Nevada	35,452,233
New Mexico.....	500,000
Oregon	609,070
Washington	154,535
Utah	3,911,601
Wyoming.....	100,000
Total	72,428,206

Total Production of Precious Metals for the Year 1875.

(Report closes December 31.)

Arizona ..	\$109,093
California	17,753,151
Colorado	6,299,817
Idaho ..	1,544,902
Montana.....	3,573,609
Nevada.....	40,478,369
Mexico	2,408,671
Oregon	1,165,046
Washington	81,932
Utah	5,687,494
British Columbia.....	1,776,953

Total .. 80,889,037

In the preparation of this paper the writer is particularly indebted to Rossiter W. Raymond, United States Commissioner of Mining Statistics; to Honorable H. R. Linderman, Director United States Mints; to T. S. Hunt, of Boston, and to Colonel Elery C. Ford, Chief of Mineral Division, General Land Office. To the last named gentleman especial obligations are acknowledged, not only for valuable notes of personal observation with facts and figures, but for the full and complete report of the amount of precious metals produced in the States and Territories west of the Missouri river, including British Columbia, for the year ending December 31, 1875.

REBEL COTTON CLAIMS—PAST AND PROSPECTIVE TREASURY RAIDS.

War is horrible enough even in a righteous cause, and against an enemy who had injured you. But a rebellion against freedom and the rights of humanity was simply damnable. Had it succeeded it would have turned back the hands of the dial of time for a century. If the South could pray for its success, it was only on the same ground that the wrecker asked heaven to direct the noble ship to the rock in the direct line of which his false light had been placed. Up to the beginning of the rebellion the country had kept pace with the world's advance except in the slave States, the principles of the North being the salt which had kept the nation from the corruption of slavery by enforcing and upholding freedom. Against freedom for all men and equality before the law, the South hurled itself with a vindictive

bitterness which the world could not understand, and if other nations suffered for the want of the Southern staple, it bid for their sympathy by endeavoring to provide facilities for obtaining cotton. The full extent of the bait thus offered will never be known. But enough is known to account for the expectation in the South of foreign aid. Meantime the war was made an instrument for profitable trade. Rebel cotton, cotton belonging to the Confederacy, was pledged and sold abroad for money to carry on the conflict. Cotton belonging to disloyal men was hoarded for sale when the rebellion should succeed, and cotton purchased of such men was moved for shipment at the first opportunity. When our troops penetrated the South such cotton was seized on behalf of the United States Government as enemy's property, the pro-

ceeds of which would be covered into the Treasury. The Republican party, which was in power through all the years of the war, and up to the end of the session of Congress in March, 1875, had passed laws which did more than justice in the premises. Indeed, they were often the means of putting money inadvertently in the pockets of men who deserved no sympathy whatever, for they had aided to redder the land with blood.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his report for 1876, says that the number of bales of cotton seized after the 30th of June, 1865, the proceeds of which reached the Treasury was about 50,000, and the net proceeds thereof, averaging the same at \$100 per bale, was \$5,000,000. The fifth section of the act of May 18, 1872, directs the Secretary to pay to the lawful owners or their legal representatives the net proceeds actually paid into the Treasury after that date. The number of claims filed under this act was 1,336; the whole number of bales claimed is 136,877, the net proceeds of which at \$100 per bale, would be \$13,687,700. It is well known, says the Secretary, that a large number of persons from whom cotton was seized have made no claim whatever. Under these circumstances, he remarks, the magnitude of the aggregate of claims presented is worthy of attention.

In 1875 the Secretary reports that the number of claims filed under the act was 1,336, which have been acted upon as follows:

Allowed.....	39
Rejected.....	1,181
Dismissed for want of jurisdiction.....	96
Under examination.....	20

The amount paid out on the claims allowed, as aforesaid, is \$180,358.43.

The claims now under examination will be disposed of in a short time. Upon their decision all proceedings under the act will be finally closed.

The following table contains a summarized statement of the proceeds of captured and abandoned property covered into the Treasury, and the amounts that have been awarded and paid therefrom under the several acts of Congress:

Proceeds of captured and abandoned property covered into the Treasury.....	\$20,910,656 44
Awarded to claimants by Court of Claims under the act of March 12, 1863.....	\$11,348,247 73

Paid to claimants by the Secretary of the Treasury under the act of May 18, 1872....	\$180,358 43
Paid on judgments against Treasury agents under the act of July 27, 1868.....	39,188 17
Paid under various relief acts of Congress.....	228,250 81
Disbursed for expenses under joint resolution of March 30, 1868.....	75,000 00

Total..... 11,871,045 14

Which deducted from the total amount received as above, leaves a balance of..... 9,039,611 30

Since the date of the above report the sum of \$4,596.04 has been paid to claimants under the act of May 18, 1872, and which, added to the amount above stated, makes a total of \$184,954.47.

The Southern Claims Commission has not been idle, nor as a general thing have the claimants from the South been at all backward, in presenting evidence on which they hoped to receive large sums from the Treasury. It is very clear that no claim ought to be admitted against the United States growing out of the destruction or appropriation of, or through damage to property, by the army or navy engaged in the suppression of the rebellion. That was the act of the South, entered upon with a full knowledge of what it involved. If the property of rebel enemies was taken or destroyed by the Federal forces, it was an act of war justified by the condition of affairs. Had there been no rebellion, there would have been no collision between the South and the Federal Government, and no devastation by armed men. The South, therefore, has no just demand on the nation for the payment of losses incurred through its own appeal to the arbitrament of the sword, and the nation can refuse to recognize such demands with perfect honor. Nevertheless, there are claims which may fairly be made, and which it is the duty of the Government to pay; and Republican legislation has prepared the way for their examination and settlement. The following shows what has been done by the commissioners:

Number of claims decided, 9,222; amount claimed, \$19,263,437.51; amount allowed, \$3,057,894.09; amount disallowed, \$16,205,543.42.

The supreme effort of the South to destroy

the Union having failed, the Treasury of the United States came out of the ordeal with a kind of fascinating safety. The war over, and the spirit of destruction allayed in the bosoms of the warriors in gray, it was far more peaceful and pleasant to rekindle that spirit and divert it to besiege the Treasury. Hands which had fired rebel bullets into the Federal ranks put aside the musket for the pen. The yelling "Tigers," and other soldiers on the Confederate side resolved to try whether the pen was stronger than the musket or the sword. Armed with that innocent weapon, which may sign a death warrant or mark the number of kisses sent by a lover to his mistress in a *billet doux*, they proceeded to prepare the papers for claims for presentation to the commission. But there seems to have been a limit fixed by the commission beyond which no one was allowed to pass, and there must, in consequence, have been considerable mortification, if not dismay. The short table given is full of instruction. It abounds, indeed, with lessons for all sorts of people, particularly for claimants whose disappointment it respectfully figures out. It will be observed that the amount claimed was in round numbers nineteen millions of dollars; the amount allowed was three millions, leaving a trifling difference in the shape of a believed overcharge of sixteen millions! The martial claimants or claim agents whose sad failure the table records, of course, bought their experience, and can only profit by it on other occasions. But there are claimants who have no experience in the matter at all, as yet, but who may learn much from that table when they shall follow the lead of their disappointed brethren and present papers. The Secretary refers to the holding back claimants whose elevation of soul has not reached the standard—who have not put forth their claim for a pile of greenbacks of a most astonishing height. He says: Claims against the Government have been permitted to sleep until the officers connected with the transactions out of which they arose have died or gone out of service, and have then been revived and supported by *ex parte* testimony of such character as to cause their allowance by the accounting officers. Such claims the Secretary recommends should be barred if

not presented within a period of six years, and it is a very proper recommendation.

It is manifest, however, that the change in the composition of the House of Representatives has endangered the Treasury. Ex-Confederate participants in the rebellion are there in full sympathy with the Bourbon Democracy. A Democratic slave-owner always boasted that he was a great man, a superior being, born to command. Enlightened citizens derided the claim. The boasts of Southern superiority were despised by Republicans, who could not see any greatness in a slaveholder who lived in ease on the thralldom of others, and paid no wages to his workmen. To the Republican party the country is largely indebted for its safety and unity as a nation. But the boldness and patriotism of Republicans should be contrasted with the wretched attitude of the Democratic leaders, who have forgotten nothing and learned nothing, either through or after the war. Vigilance is more necessary at this time than at any period of the country's history. A rebellion was inaugurated; a great war was fought to put it down; a huge public debt has been created. And the purse strings are now in the hands of the enemy who fought to destroy the Union, and their party associates! Will the people tolerate a repeal of laws which have guarded the public money hitherto, and allow access to the Treasury by men who were denied before, but who may under legal sanction obtain millions? Are the people willing to have Republican legislation repealed, so that the public money may be drawn out by men who were known to be disloyal, and whose claims have been barred or rejected on that account? Will the loyal people of the nation pay rebel claims to men still disloyal, but on laws introduced by their sympathizing Democratic friends in the House of Representatives, and passed by the votes of an ex-Confederate majority placed there only through the grace and forgiveness of Republicans who have so long constituted its majority?

The school question is logically compassed by the declaration—that the public schools are and must be sustained by the State to maintain and save the State. If any church wishes to maintain schools for its own benefit the right is not denied, but its communicants owe duties as citizens, and the maintenance of public schools is one of them.

THE CONFEDERATE LEADERS IN CONGRESS.

The following facts are compiled chiefly from the "Congressional Directory" for the Forty-Fourth Congress, a work compiled by Major Ben. Perley Poore, clerk of printing records, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, or whose records are shown by the Confederate war records now in the archives of the War Department. The authority is quoted in the following extracts from the sources above stated, and from others:

ALABAMA.—*Senator* GEORGE GOLDTHWAITE, of Montgomery; was adjutant general of the State of Alabama during the war.

2d District—Representative JEREMIAH N. WILLIAMS, of Clayton; entered the Confederate army in 1861 as major.

3d District—Rep. PAUL BRADFORD, of Talladega; served in the Confederate army throughout the war.

5th District—Rep. JOHN H. CALDWELL, of Jacksonville; was elected solicitor for the tenth judicial circuit by the legislature, at the session of 1859-'60; re-elected at the session of 1863-'64. This statement shows that he was an officer of the rebel State government, and also of President Johnson's reactionary movement.

6th District—Rep. GOLDSMITH W. HEWITT, of Birmingham; entered the Confederate army in 1861, and served until severely wounded at the battle of Chickamauga in 1863.

At large—Rep. WILLIAM HENRY FORNEY, of Jacksonville; entered the Confederate army at the commencement of hostilities in 1861, as captain, and was successively promoted major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and brigadier-general; surrendered at Appomattox C. H.; was a member of the State Senate of Alabama 1865-'66, (under the Johnson provisional government.)

*At large—*BURWELL BOYKIN LEWIS, of Tuscaloosa; served in the Confederate army as an officer in the Second Alabama cavalry.

ARKANSAS—*1st District—Rep.* LUCIEN C. GAUSE, of Jacksonport; entered the Confederate army in 1861, and served throughout the war, attaining the rank of colonel. This person served with Major General Fagan, of whose actions in the Steele-Rice Arkansas campaign of April, 1864, so conservative authority as Harper's "History of the Great Rebellion" states in relation to the capture of a Federal train at Marks' Mills that, according to custom, all negroes found in the command after surrender were shot. These were not soldiers, but teamsters, servants, and contrabands.

2d District—Rep. WILLIAM F. SLEMONS, of

Monticello; was a member of the Arkansas State (secession) convention in 1861; entered the Confederate army in July, 1861, and served through the war. He was a brigade commander under Fagan in the campaign against Steele, in April, 1864, at Poison Springs, near Camden, Ark., when nearly two hundred men belonging to the First Kansas colored (79th U. S. C. T.) regiment were murdered after being wounded or surrendering. He was also in the campaign under Price, in September and October, 1864, by which Western Missouri and Kansas were invaded and partly desolated. The atrocities perpetrated were numerous. An account of them may be found in a rebel book published at Cincinnati, entitled "Shelby and His Men"—the author of which served with Slemmons, and in the "Army of the Border," by R. J. Hinton, and "The Annals of Kansas," by D. W. Wilder, State Auditor of Kansas.

In the rebel account of the Price campaign in Missouri and Kansas the following description of the atrocities that were enacted is given. It relates to the division under "Joe" Shelby, but is true of the whole force:

"No prisoners were taken, and why should there be? * * He was fighting the Devil with fire, and smoking him to death. Haystacks, houses, barns, produce, crops, and farming implements were consumed before the march of his squadrons, and what the flames spared the bullets finished." Colonel Hinton thus describes what he saw: "They had entered Kansas. The first house across the line was the scene of a dastardly murder. An old, gray-haired minister of the gospel lay dead, with white locks reddened by his own blood. The women and children were frantic and crazed by terror and grief. The fence and outhouses were burning. The interior of the cabin presented a woe-begone appearance. A perfect saturnalia of destruction seemed to have reigned. Everything not portable had been broken * * The frightened inmates were stripped of nearly every article of clothing on their persons, or in the cabin."—*Army of the Border*, p. 190, 1865.

*4th District—*THOMAS MONTICUE GUNTER, of Fayetteville; was a delegate from Washington county in the Arkansas State Convention of May, 1861; served in the Confederate army as colonel Thirteenth Arkansas volunteers. He was also in Fagan's command.

FLORIDA—*Senator* CHARLES W. JONES; was born in Ireland. He was a brigadier-general in the Confederate army, as the Confederate War Department records establish.

GEORGIA—*Senator* THOMAS MANSON NORWOOD, of Savannah; was a member of the

Georgia (rebel) legislature in 1861-'62. In July, 1875, the Senator delivered an address, supposed to be non-political in character, at the commencement of Emory College, Georgia. From a report of this effort published in the Democratic press of that State, it appears Mr. Norwood declared that he charged "the Yankees as having waged the last war, not for patriotism or the Constitution, but for dollars and cents. He deplored the fact that the Government was controlled 'by a low order of intellect and a low order of men'—condemned the fifteenth amendment and the carpet-bagger. The thirteenth and fourteenth amendments he declared to be probably the only permanent results of the war. He said the negro had been left among a race superior to him in every particular to work out his own destiny, and that there would never be unity of the two races; that the negro as a race would never acquire either education or wealth; that he would never occupy the same social plane with the white race; that the common school system would in time prove a failure as to the negro; that it cannot succeed except among a homogeneous people, and a people who are on a social equality; that he would never appreciate nor exercise intelligently the privileges of citizenship; that the failure to contribute to the educational fund would in time lead to separate taxation for separate schools, and the system as to this race would fail; that the next generation of them will not be equal to the present as laborers and citizens * * * In the course of time the people of the North would themselves demand of him either colonization or the surrender of the elective franchise, and the fifteenth amendment will be repealed. * * To be a harmonious people, we must be a homogeneous people; the negro as a slave was always a disturbing element, and will be an irritation in the republic as a freeman."

Senator JOHN B. GORDON, of Atlanta; at the beginning of the war entered the Confederate army as captain of infantry, and was promoted major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, brigadier-general, major-general, and to the command of the second army corps; commanded one wing of General Lee's army at Appomattox Court-House; was wounded in battle eight times. Senator Gordon's position since the surrender, as well as his view of the act of secession, and the subsequent war thereon, have been given at length by himself in his testimony before the famous Ku-Klux Committee of Investigation. The report thus summarizes views he then held: "His testimony is that the magnanimity and deference shown by General Grant and his officers towards the army of the South at the time of and after the surrender led them to hope

they would be permitted to go home, resume their places and rights as citizens, organize the State governments, and again resume their relations to the General Government, as if there had been no rebellion. After President Lincoln's death, and Johnson's announcement of his policy, they became apprehensive that some hanging and general confiscation would follow. When relieved of those apprehensions, and terms of reconstruction and the fourteenth amendment were proposed by Congress, they began to complain of want of good faith, and when terms were imposed they became sullen and defiant, looking upon the Government as having outraged them, and deprived them of their rights." General Gordon said: "We feel a sense of wrong as honorable men. We do not think we have done anything in the dark." Of secession he said: "We thought we were right. I am one of those who thought so at the time. I thought I had a perfect right to do as I did. * * By the course that has been pursued to us * * we have been disappointed, and the feeling of alienation * * has in this way been increased more than by any other one fact." Gordon declared that "We did not believe the act of secession was treason. I do not believe it now. I do not expect ever to believe it." In regard to secret organizations for the advancement of Southern interests General Gordon testified as to what he termed a "brotherhood," admitting that he was asked to become the chief in Georgia; that it was widely extended; that the members took an obligation tantamount to an oath; that it was confined to white men, and that no white Republican was found in it; that it was "mainly confined to soldiers of the army," (Confederate,) men who were "ready for any emergency," &c. The likeness of this to the Ku-Klux was unmistakable. When Gordon entered the Senate, the Republicans having a majority in both bodies, he very carefully excluded from the sketch in the "Congressional Directory" of that date all reference to his Confederate military record, while as seen above in the later Directory he states it at length. There is a Democratic majority in the House, and it is honorable to parade treason in behalf of slavery and disunion.

1st District—Rep. JULIAN HARTRIDGE, of Savannah; delegate to the Charleston Democratic Convention in 1860; was in the Confederate army during first year of the war; was a member of the Confederate Congress.

2d District—Rep. WILLIAM E. SMITH, of Albany; entered the Confederate army as a volunteer, in the Fourth Georgia Volunteers, after the State seceded; was elected captain in April, 1862; lost a leg in the defense of Richmond, at King's School-House, June 25, 1862;

was elected to the Confederate Congress in 1863.

3d District—Rep. PHILIP COOK, of Americus; was elected to the State Senate of Georgia, in 1863, (rebel;) was elected a member of the State Convention of 1865, called by President Johnson; entered the Confederate service in 1861, as a private; was commissioned first lieutenant, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and in August, 1863, brigadier-general.

4th District—Rep. HENRY R. HARRIS, of Greenville; was a member of the Georgia (secession) Convention of 1861.

5th District—Rep. MILTON A. CANDLER, of Atlanta; was a member of the State (rebel) House of Representatives in 1861-'63; of the State Constitutional Convention in 1865—the body called by President Johnson.

8th District—Rep. ALEXANDER HAMILTON STEPHENS, of Crawfordsville; was elected to the Secession Convention of Georgia in 1861; opposed and voted against the ordinance of secession in that body, but gave it his support after it had been passed by the convention against his judgment as to its policy; was elected by that convention to the Confederate Congress which met at Montgomery, Alabama, February 4, 1861, and was chosen vice-president under the Provisional government by that Congress; was elected vice-president of the Confederate States for the term of six years under what was termed the permanent government, in November, 1861; visited the State of Virginia on a mission under the Confederate Government in April, 1861, upon the invitation of that State; was one of the commissioners on the part of the Confederate Government at the Hampton Roads Conference in February, 1865; was elected a Representative to the Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, Thirtieth, Thirty-first, Thirty-second, Thirty-third, Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth Congresses, when he declined a re-election; was elected to the Senate of the United States in 1866, by the first legislature convened under the new Constitution (the Johnson provisional movement), but was not allowed to take his seat. Mr. Stephens has rendered the sectional South the most important aid ever since he entered public life. In 1850 he assisted to draw up, and earnestly advocated the famous "Georgia platform," which declared that the State of Georgia "will, and ought to resist, even (as a last resort,) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, any future act of Congress abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent and petition of the slaveholders thereof; or any act abolishing slavery in places within the slaveholding States purchased by the United States for the erection of forts, magazines, dock yards, navy yards, and other like places; or in any act suppressing the slave

trade between slaveholding States; or in any refusal to admit as a State any territory applying because of the existence of slavery therein; or in any act prohibiting the introduction of slaves into the Territories of Utah and New Mexico; or in any act repealing or materially modifying the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves."

In a speech to the Georgia legislature, November, 1860, Mr. Stephens said that he stood on the "Georgia platform," as he had always done since its adoption, and if the Republicans attempted by an act of Congress to exclude the slaveholders from the Territories with their slave property no man would be more willing or ready than he to disrupt every tie which bound the States together. But he advised the people to wait until the Republican policy was adopted before they tried secession. The "Secessionists" favored immediate secession. In a letter to a strong secessionist in New York he gave the following reason for advocating the policy of delay:

"The great and leading object aimed at by me at Milledgeville was to produce harmony on a right line of policy. If worst comes to worst, as it may, and our State has to quit the Union, it is of the utmost importance that all our people should be united cordially in this cause. This, I feel confident, can only be effected on the line of policy I indicated."

Before a similar body, February, 1866, Mr. Stephens used the following notable language:

"Whatever may be said of the loyalty or disloyalty of any in the late most lamentable conflict of arms, I think I may venture safely to say that there was on the part of the great mass of the people of Georgia and of the entire South, no disloyalty to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. * * * As for myself I can affirm that no sentiment of disloyalty to these great principles of self-government, recognized and embodied in the Constitution of the United States, ever beat or throbbed in breast or heart of mine. To their maintenance my whole soul was ever enlisted; and to this end my whole life has heretofore been devoted, and will continue to be the rest of my days—God willing. * * * Whatever differences existed amongst us arose from differences as to the best and surest means of securing these great ends, which was the object of all. It was with this view and for this purpose secession was tried. That has failed. * * * Our only alternative now is either to give up all hope of Constitutional liberty, or retrace our steps, and to look for its vindication and maintenance in the forums of reason and justice, instead of on the arena of arms. In the court and halls of legislation, instead of on the field of battle." * * *

Although Mr. Stephens has not publicly advocated the Confederate cause as zealously since July, 1873, as before that time, yet in his speech in Congress in opposition to the civil rights bill, January 5, 1874, and in a Fourth of July oration at Atlanta, 1875, he presented with his accustomed adroitness the arguments in favor of State sovereignty. He is the ablest of Southern thinkers and leaders, and his book "The War Between the States" is in title and contents the arsenal of that doctrine.

9th District—Rep. BENJAMIN H. HILL, of Atlanta; was a member of the Confederate States Senate, and of the Georgia Secession Convention of 1861. Mr. Hill was regarded in the Confederate Senate as the Confederate President's other self. Mr. Davis spoke of him as his "right hand." He was chairman of its judiciary committee, and reported and advocated the following resolutions or bills:

"That every person pretending to be a soldier or officer of the United States who shall be captured on the soil of the Confederate States after the first day of January, 1863, shall be presumed to have entered the territory of the Confederate States with the intent to incite insurrection and abet murder; and, unless satisfactory proof be adduced to the contrary before the military court before which the trial shall be had, shall suffer death. This section shall continue in force until the proclamation issued by Abraham Lincoln, dated at Washington on the 22d day of September, 1862, shall be rescinded, and the policy therein announced shall be abandoned, and no longer."

"2. Every white person who shall act as a commissioned or non-commissioned officer, commanding negroes or mulattoes against the Confederate States, or who shall arm, organize, train, or prepare negroes or mulattoes for military service, or aid them in any military enterprise against the Confederate States, shall, if captured, suffer death.

"3. Every commissioned or non-commissioned officer of the enemy who shall incite slaves to rebellion, or pretend to give them freedom under the aforementioned act of Congress and proclamation, by abducting or causing them to be abducted or inducing them to abscond, shall, if captured, suffer death."

Jefferson Davis issued, December 22d, 1862, a proclamation declaring outlaws General Butler and the men of his command; also consigning to death, or slavery, or capture, officers commanding and men serving in colored regiments.

To enforce this proclamation of Mr. Davis' a law was passed on the first of May, 1863, by the Confederate Congress, reported from the judiciary committee by Mr. Hill, of Georgia. Section 4 of the law reads as follows:

"SEC. 4. That every white person being a commissioned officer, or acting as such, who during the present war shall command negroes or mulattoes in arms against the Confederate States, or who shall arm, train, organize, or prepare negroes or mulattoes for military service against the Confederate States, or who shall voluntarily aid negroes or mulattoes in any military enterprise, attack, or conflict in such service, shall be deemed as inciting servile insurrection, and shall, if captured, be put to death or be otherwise punished, at the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 5. Every person being a commissioned officer, or acting as such in the service of the enemy, who shall during the present war excite, attempt to excite, or cause to be excited a servile insurrection, or who shall incite or cause to be incited a slave to rebel, shall, if captured, be put to death, or be otherwise punished, at the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 7. All negroes and mulattoes who shall be engaged in war or be taken in arms against the Confederate States, or shall give aid or comfort to the enemies of the Confederate States, shall, when captured in the Confederate States, be delivered to the authorities of the State or States in which they shall be captured, to be dealt with according to the present or future laws of such State or States."

In a late speech made in Georgia, Mr. Hill said:

"The great final struggle to settle the question whether Constitutional liberty on this continent shall be continued or not is to be fought in 1876. Can it be successfully fought with the ballot? * * * If we fail at the ballot-box in 1876 by reason of force, a startling question will present itself to the American people. * * * I tell you, my friends, there is no peace for this country until Radicalism is crushed; not only crushed, but despised; not only despised, but made infamous forever throughout America. If we must have war—if we cannot preserve this Constitution and Constitutional government by the ballot; * * * if folly and wickedness—if inordinate love of power shall decree that America must save her Constitution by blood, let it come. I am ready. But let one thing be distinctly understood, that if another war should come we of the South will rally under the old flag of our fathers. It always was our flag. We were never faithless to it, and our enemies were never faithful to it."

In his speech in the House of Representatives, January 11, 1876, Mr. Hill gave further expression to these ideas when he declared that "the South is here, and here she intends to remain. Go on and pass your qualifying acts, trample upon the Constitu-

tion you have sworn to support, abnegate the pledges of your fathers, incite rage upon our people, and multiply your infidelities until they shall be like the stars of heaven or the sands of the seashore, without number; but know this, for all your iniquities the South will never again seek a remedy in the madness of another secession. We are here; we are in the house of our fathers, our brothers are our companions, and we are at home to stay, thank God.

* * * We come charging upon the Union no wrongs to us. The Union never wronged us. The Union has been an unmixed blessing to every section, to every State, to every man of every color in America. We charge all our wrongs upon that 'higher law.' We wronged the Union grievously when we left it to be seized and rent and torn by the men who had denounced it as a 'covenant with hell and a league with the Devil.' "

KENTUCKY—7th District—Rep. JOSEPH C. S. BLACKBURN, of Versailles; entered the Confederate army in 1861, and served throughout the war. It is charged that his service was almost wholly that of a guerilla, engaged in harrying the Unionists of Kentucky.

LOUISIANA—1st District—Rep. RANDALL LEE GIBSON, of New Orleans; joined the Confederate army as a private soldier, and was promoted to the command of a company, regiment, brigade, and division.

2d District—Rep. E. JOHN ELLIS, of New Orleans; graduated in March, 1861; joined the Confederate army five days afterward, and served throughout the war.

4th District—Rep. WILLIAM M. LEVY, of Natchitoches; was a member of the State legislature of Louisiana in 1861; was a Presidential elector on the Breckinridge and Lane ticket in 1860; served in the Confederate army, participating in the engagements on the peninsula in 1861 and 1862, and thereafter, until the close of the war, in the adjutant and inspector general's department on the staff of General Dick Taylor.

MISSISSIPPI—1st District—Rep. LUCIUS Q. C. LAMAR, of Oxford; was elected to the Thirty-fifth and Thirty-sixth Congresses of the United States, and resigned in 1860 to take a seat in the Secession Convention of his State; in 1861, entered the Confederate army as lieutenant-colonel of the Nineteenth regiment, and was promoted to the colonelcy; in 1863, was entrusted by President Davis with an important diplomatic mission to Russia.

4th District—Rep. ORTHO R. SINGLETON, of Canton; was a representative from Mississippi in the Thirty-third, Thirty-fifth and Thirty-sixth Congresses of the United States, retiring January 12, 1861; was a representative from Mississippi in the Confederate Congress from 1861 until 1865.

MISSOURI—Senator F. M. COCKRELL, of Warrensburg; entered the Confederate army as a colonel in the Missouri State Guard, and was promoted to major-general, serving till the rebellion closed.

4th District—Rep. ROBERT A. HATCHER, of New Madrid; was a member of the State (rebel) convention in 1862, and a member of the Confederate Congress in 1864-'65.

8th District—Rep. BENJAMIN J. FRANKLIN, of Kansas City; entered the Confederate army as a private, was promoted captain, and served throughout the war. He was an active pro-slavery politician in Kansas, being known, in fact, among those called "Border Ruffians."

11th District—Rep. JOHN B. CLARK, Jr., of Fayette; at the commencement of the late war he entered the Confederate army as a lieutenant, and was promoted successively to be captain, major, colonel, and brigadier-general. Clark served in Marmaduke's division, and was a brigade commander in the Price raid of 1864.

NORTH CAROLINA—Senator MATT W. RANSOM, of Northampton county, (post office Weldon;) entered the Confederate army, serving as lieutenant-colonel, colonel, brigadier-general, and major-general and surrendered at Appomattox.

Senator AUGUSTUS SUMMERFIELD MERRIMON, of Raleigh; was a member of the legislature of North Carolina in 1860-'61; was solicitor (rebel) of the 8th judicial district of North Carolina from 1861 to 1865.

1st District—Rep. JESSE J. YEATES, of Murfreesboro'; served in the Confederate army, and was major of the 31st regiment North Carolina troops; was solicitor (rebel) of the 1st judicial circuit of North Carolina from 1861 to 1866.

3d District—Rep. ALFRED MOORE WADDELL, of Wilmington; served in the Confederate army as lieutenant-colonel of cavalry.

4th District—Rep. JOSEPH J. DAVIS, of Louisville; served in the Confederate army as captain.

5th District—Rep. ALFRED MOORE SCALES, of Greensborough; was a member of the Thirty-fifth Congress; volunteered at the beginning of the late civil war as a private in the Confederate army; was afterward promoted and served as captain, colonel, and brigadier-general, and for the war.

6th District—Rep. THOMAS SAMUEL ASHE, of Wadesborough; was elected in 1861 to the House of Representatives of the Confederate States, and to the Senate of the Confederate States in 1864. A Mr. Ashe, of North Carolina, voted in Congress for the repeal of the Missouri compromise.

7th District—Rep. WILLIAM M. ROBBINS, of Statesville; was an officer in the Confederate army during the whole war.

8th District—Rep. ROBERT BRANK VANCE, of Asheville; was elected a captain of a company in the Confederate service in 1861; was twice elected colonel of the 29th North Carolina regiment, and was appointed brigadier-general in 1863.

TENNESSEE—Senator DAVID MCKENDREE KER, of Chattanooga; entered the Confederate army in 1861, and served through the entire war.

3d District—Rep. GEORGE GIBBS DIBRELL, of Sparta; was elected to the State (rebel) Legislature of Tennessee, in August, 1861; entered the Confederate army as a private, was elected lieutenant-colonel, and promoted colonel and brigadier-general of cavalry; was detailed to escort the executive officers and treasure of the Confederate Government after the evacuation of Richmond.

4th District—Rep. HAYWOOD YANCEY RIDGLE, of Lebanon; entered the Confederate army as a private in 1861, and served through the war.

6th District—Rep. JOHN F. HOUSE, of Clarks-ville; was a member of the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States from Tennessee; at the expiration of his term of service in said body he entered the Confederate army, and continued therein until the close of the war.

7th District—Rep. WASHINGTON CURRAN WHITTHORNE, of Columbia; was assistant adjutant-general in the Provisional army of Tennessee in 1861, and was afterward adjutant general of the State, which position he held under Governor Harris until the close of the civil war.

8th District—Rep. JOHN D. C. ATKINS, of Paris; was lieutenant-colonel of the 5th Tennessee regiment in the Confederate army in 1861; was elected to the Confederate Provisional Congress in August, 1861; was re-elected in November, 1861, and again elected in November, 1863.

10th District—Rep. CASEY YOUNG, of Memphis; entered the Tennessee army as a private; was afterward appointed assistant adjutant general upon the staff of General William H. Carroll, and was subsequently assigned to the command of a regiment of cavalry in General Chalmer's division. He also served under Forrest at the time of the massacre of Fort Pillow. In a report made by a Congressional committee that investigated this atrocity at the time, the scenes that followed the occupation of the fort, which was treacherously gained by advancing under cover of a flag of truce, are thus described:

"The rebels commenced an indiscriminate slaughter, sparing neither age nor sex, white nor black, soldier or civilian. The officers and men seemed to vie with each other in the devilish work; men, women,

and even children, wherever found, were deliberately shot down, beaten, hacked with sabres; some of the children, not more than ten years old, were forced to stand up and face their murderers while being shot; the sick and wounded were butchered without mercy, the rebels even entering the hospital building and dragging them out to be shot, or killing them as they lay there unable to offer the least resistance. * * * No cruelty which the most fiendish malignity could devise was omitted by these murderers. *

* The huts and tents in which many of the wounded had sought shelter were set on fire, both that night and next morning, while the wounded were still in them. * * * These deeds of murder and cruelty ceased when night came on, only to be renewed next morning, when the demons carefully sought among the dead lying about in all directions for any of the wounded yet alive, and those they found were deliberately shot." The following dispatch was sent by Forrest to Polk: "Rebels killed five hundred men, (no prisoners.) The officers in the fort were killed. Over one hundred citizens who had fled into the fort to escape conscription ran into the river and were drowned." Of the conduct of Colonel Casey Young's troops, and of himself, of course, who were under Chalmer's command, and aided in this capture and massacre, Forrest said in his official report: "I desire to acknowledge the prompt and energetic action of Brigadier General Chalmers, commanding the forces around Fort Pillow. * * * He has reason to be proud of the conduct of the officers and men of his command for their gallantry and courage in assaulting the enemy's works without the assistance of artillery or bayonets."

TEXAS—Senator SAM BELL MAXEY, of Paris; educated at West Point, was elected State Senator for four years in 1861, but declined, and raised the 9th Texas infantry for the Confederate States army, of which he was colonel; was promoted to brigadier-general in 1862, and major-general in 1864; commanded the Indian Territory military district 1863-'65, and was also superintendent of Indian affairs. During the war Quantrille, the Missouri guerilla, was sheltered in Maxey's department after his atrocious massacres at Lawrence and Baxter's Springs, Kansas, placed him under the ban of outlawry.

1st District—Rep. JOHN H. REAGAN, of Palestine; was elected in 1857 a representative to the Thirty-fifth Congress from the first district of Texas, and was re-elected in 1859 to the Thirty-sixth Congress; was elected to the secession convention of Texas in 1861, and was elected, with others, by that convention deputy to the Provisional Congress

of the Confederacy; was appointed postmaster-general of the Provisional Government of the Confederacy, March 6, 1861; was re-appointed on the permanent organization of the Confederate Government in 1862, and occupied the position until the close of the war; was also appointed acting secretary of the treasury of the Confederate Government.

Mr. Reagan, as rebel Postmaster General, was asked by Jefferson Davis for his views on the question of surrender during the pendency of the Sherman-Johnston negotiation in North Carolina, 1865. General H. V. Boynton, in his critical work reviewing General Sherman's memoirs, publishes a photolithographic copy of Reagan's memorandum for terms of armistice, as also his letter in response to Davis. In both these documents the most ultra State sovereignty ideas are advocated and set forth. Mr. Reagan was a candidate for delegate to the recent Constitutional Convention in Texas. This was after his election to Congress. During the canvass Judge Reagan strongly opposed the common schools, declared it unjust to tax the well-to-do in order to educate the poor; advocated the re-establishment of the whipping post as a punishment for petty larceny and petty crimes; and proposed that all other convictions should be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary, and consequent disfranchisement. This is one method of reducing the colored vote.

2d District—Rep. DAVID B. CULBERSON, of Jefferson; was a member of the State House of Representatives of Texas (rebel) in 1866, and to the State Senate (Johnson) 1866; entered the Confederate army as a private in 1862, and was promoted until he became adjutant general with the rank of colonel.

3d District—Rep. JAMES W. THROCKMORTON, of McKinney; elected to the State (rebel) Senate in 1863, and served until the surrender of General Lee; was elected a delegate to the State Constitutional Convention under President Johnson's proclamation, and was chosen presiding officer of that body; was elected Governor of Texas in June, 1866, for a term of five years; was inaugurated August 8, 1866, and removed by order of General Sheridan, August 9, 1867.

VIRGINIA—Senator ROBERT E. WITHERS, of Wytheville; entered the Confederate army as major of infantry in April, 1861, and during the same year was promoted colonel of the 18th Virginia regiment, which he commanded until retired in consequence of numerous disabling wounds, and appointed to command the post at Danville, Virginia, which position he held until the close of the war.

1st District—Rep. BEVERLY B. DOUGLAS, of Aylett; entered the Confederate army as first lieutenant in Lee's Rangers, and was

successively promoted to the rank of major of the 5th Virginia cavalry.

2d District—Rep. JOHN GOODE, Jr., of Norfolk; was elected in 1860 a member of the State (Secession) Convention of Virginia, which passed the ordinance of secession; was twice elected a member of the Confederate Congress, and served in that capacity from February 22, 1862, until the close of the war; was appointed a member of the National Democratic Executive Committee in 1868, and reappointed in 1872 for four years.

5th District—Rep. GEORGE C. CABELL, of Danville; volunteered as a private soldier in the southern army; in June, 1861, he was commissioned major by Governor Letcher, and assigned to the 18th Virginia infantry, Colonel Withers, Pickett's division, Longstreet's corps; participated in most of the battles fought by that portion of the army of Northern Virginia to which he was attached; was twice wounded, and left the army at the close of the war, with the rank of colonel.

6th District—Rep. JOHN RANDOLPH TUCKER, of Lexington; was attorney-general of Virginia from 1857 to 1865. Is also borne as a captain on the Confederate army rolls.

7th District—Rep. JOHN T. HARRIS, of Harrisonburg; was a member of the Thirty-sixth Congress of the United States; was a member of the Confederate Legislature from 1863 to '65.

8th District—Rep. EPPA HUNTON, of Warrenton; was elected to the State Convention of Virginia, which assembled at Richmond in February, 1861; served through its first session, and then entered the Confederate army as colonel of the 8th Virginia infantry; was promoted after the battle of Gettysburg, and served through the residue of the war as brigadier-general.

9th District—Rep. WILLIAM TERRY, of Wytheville; was in the military service of Virginia in the "John Brown raid," in 1859; entered the Confederate army in April, 1861, as lieutenant in the 4th Virginia infantry, "Stonewall Brigade," and served during the war.

WEST VIRGINIA—Senator ALLEN TAYLOR CAPERTON, of Union; was a member of the State (Secession) Constitutional Convention of Virginia in 1861; was elected by the Legislature of Virginia a member of the Confederate States Senate, and served until the close of the war in 1865.

2d District—Rep. CHARLES JAMES FAULKNER, of Martinsburg; was elected to the House of Representatives in the Thirty-second, Thirty-third, Thirty-fourth, and Thirty-fifth Congresses, serving from December 1, 1851, until March 3, 1859; was nominated in 1859 by President Buchanan as Minister Plenipotentiary to France, and confirmed by the Senate; returned to the United States in

August, 1861, and was held as a prisoner of state upon no charge or imputation against his fidelity as a minister, but from an apprehension that he would unite his fortunes with those of the Southern Confederacy; was exchanged in December, 1861, for Hon. Alfred Ely, member of the United States House of Representatives from New York, then a prisoner in Richmond; entered the Confederate army as a member of General Stonewall Jackson's staff, and served as his chief of staff until the death of that officer, having written all the official reports that bear his signature. Mr. Faulkner, it is charged, did, in 1866, or '67, take the oath then required in West Virginia before he could practice at the bar of the State courts. This oath required him to swear he had not borne arms, &c., against the Union or the State. When charged with the falsity of this, Mr. Faulkner declared he had never held a military commission; that his position was an honorary one, and that he was

with Jackson only out of friendship, and because that General was very careless about his papers.

This record of the Confederate leaders now encamped in the National Capital amply justifies the belief that they are so thoroughly representative of Southern sentiment as not to be trusted with the control of the Union. In the years that have followed the war, only one man who served in the Union army has ever been elected to Congress by Democratic votes from any district in the ex-rebel States. This is a sufficient reason for fearing a united and sectional South. It is what the Democracy design. By that sign they conquer. If they elect the President it is as the servant of the men who, first failing to destroy the Union, now seek to rule it to the same end.

A MODEL DEMOCRATIC ROBBERY—ITS PERPETRATORS UNPUNISHED.

During the year 1860 Godard Bailey, a relative of John B. Floyd, then Secretary of War, was the custodian of bonds belonging to the Indian Trust Fund, held by Jacob Thompson, Secretary of the Interior, as trustee of various Indian tribes, amounting in the aggregate to \$3,396,241.82. Said Bailey, during the year above mentioned, placed in the hands of Russell, Majors & Waddell the following bonds belonging to the Indian Trust Fund, viz:

Missouri 6 per cent. bonds.....	\$370,000
North Carolina 6 per cent. bonds...	357,000
Tennessee 6 per cent. bonds.....	143,000

Total..... 870,000

As collateral security for the return of said bonds, Russell, Majors & Waddell deposited with said Bailey acceptances of John B. Floyd, Secretary of War, amounting to eight hundred and seventy thousand dollars, issued to Russell, Majors & Waddell on account of their contract with the War Department. See the following receipt of Russell, Majors & Waddell for the above bonds:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Dec. 13th, 1860.

We acknowledge to have received from Godard Bailey, on the 13th of July last, and at various times subsequently, the following bonds, viz:

Missouri 6's.....	\$370,000
North Carolina 6's (Jan. and July)	296,000
North Carolina 6's (April and Oct.)	61,000
Tennessee 6's.....	143,000

Making a total of..... 870,000

which we agree to return to the said Godard Bailey, or to his assigns, on demand.

As collateral security for the return of the above described bonds, we have deposited with the said Godard Bailey acceptances of the Hon. John B. Floyd, Secretary of War, to the amount of eight hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

RUSSELL, MAJORS & WADDELL.

When this iniquitous act, perpetrated by one of the subordinate officers of the Interior Department, in the abstraction of said bonds was made known, it was discovered at the same time that acceptances unauthorized by law, and deceptive and fraudulent in their character, had been issued by John B. Floyd, Secretary of War, in favor of Messrs. Russell, Majors & Waddell, not only for the amount of bonds abstracted, but the records of the War Department showed that \$5,339,395 of said acceptances were in circulation, making the total amount of acceptances issued \$6,137,395.

The records of the War Department also showed that there was a deficit of \$6,137,395

to fall upon the holders of these acceptances, or to be assumed in some way by the Government.

It also appears from the records of the War Department, that while these acceptances were being issued to the amount of millions of dollars, Russell, Majors & Waddell were

regularly receiving their pay for the services performed under their contract, in money, from the Government; therefore it is evident that the acceptances were fraudulent.

For the facts contained in the foregoing statement see Report No. 78, House of Representatives, 36th Congress, 2nd Session.

THE WORK OF THE FORTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

DESIGNS OF THE DEMOCRACY.

It is at this date (March 13th, 1876,) quite beyond dispute that the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives have during the last month been deliberately engaged in working up capital for political effect in the current elections. They have paid very little attention to the legitimate and necessary business of Congress. Their attention has been very largely directed to the operations and reports of the numerous investigating committees which they have set on foot, and it would appear that all their ingenuity has been brought into requisition to discover the means of holding delinquent Republicans to punishment and disgrace and letting the Democratic tempters go. The result of this has been that the detective press of the country has been for weeks past reveling in a very carnival of obloquy and defamation, and personal explanations have followed each other on the floors of Congress like the waves of the sea. Just on the eve of the New Hampshire election, the first in the contest of the Presidential canvass, and in this centennial year of American independence, of course the excitement created has been profound.

PUBLIC TIMBER AND MINERAL LANDS.

Much discussion has arisen in regard to the public policy respecting the various classes of lands granted and reserved under the legislation of Congress. But nothing definite beyond this has transpired, and no measures have been positively settled by all the long debates.

RAILROADS.

The same general remark applies to the vast railroad interests of the country. Time has been largely consumed in the consideration of what has been done and what should

be done by Congress in regulating the action of roads already in operation and in encouraging the construction of those which have been projected. Little, however, has been accomplished beyond the exhibition of a vast number of plans and projects based upon the alleged necessities of the country, and of extended statistical information in regard to the general subject.

COMMERCE AND INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

Little or nothing has been done during the last month upon these important subjects of national interest. A few propositions have been made and a few speeches delivered without any definite or practical result.

MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS.

Congress has been occupied with a variety of questions relating to Indian reservations, to deficiencies in the Indian funds, to the transportation of animals, the slaughter of buffaloes, the ravages of insects, the erection of an inebriate asylum, public buildings, fire insurance, pharmacy, the Washington monument, the birth-day of Washington, the Pension Bureau, the revenues of the Patent Office, the funding act, the civil service reform, the revision of the bounty system, the modification of the pension laws affecting the soldiers of the war of 1812, the safe burglary and whisky trials, the duties on imports, the revenue laws, the naturalization treaties, the proper qualification of a Speaker *pro tempore* of the House of Representatives, the accurate printing of the debates and speeches in Congress, the legal construction of the Centennial appropriation bill, and the correction of the revised statutes of the United States, in which codification there are found numerous errors and conflicts, which a constantly arising exigency requires to be remedied.

THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. McCrary, of the House, (February 17, 1876,) explained the nature and object of the bill for the reorganization of the judiciary of the United States. With the growth of the country and the augmentation of human transactions, a vast accumulation of business has been thrown on the Supreme Court of the United States, making it physically impossible to sweep the docket, and thus will nigh amounting to a denial of justice. In 1810 the number of cases on the calendar was 98, in 1820 it was 127, in 1846 it was 146, in 1856 it was 266, in 1866 it was 457, in the present year it is 931. Two evils are felt—the great distance of the places of the trials below from the only place of trial by appeal, and the great delay which follows, in the decision of appeals. The proposal is to create an intermediate court of appeals. To this certain other suggestions have been added, and in this condition the subject rests.

CALIFORNIA.

A spirited reply was made in the House by Mr. Page, of California, (February 26, 1876,) in reply to the allegation of Mr. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, that California had repudiated and nullified the legal-tender act, and disparaging the condition of the State in contrast with Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin as the consequence. Mr. Page, while admitting that the circulating medium of his State is gold and silver, yet earnestly denied the charge of repudiating the legal-tender act. He presented a flattering view of the resources and productions of California, and fully vindicated his position in regard to her prosperity. The value of productions for 1875 was in the aggregate \$123,500,000; the aggregate capital and deposits in all the banks of the State is \$165,000,000. The purpose of the debate was to show that a metallic basis of currency is far better than that of paper money at a discount.

MISSISSIPPI ELECTION.

On January 20, 1876, Senator Morton, upon the question of investigating the late State election in Mississippi, presented a narrative of circumstances and statistics which seem to be well substantiated, and which disclose a reign of violence, fraud, intimidation and

cold-blooded murder that would indicate the lapse of that people into a condition far worse than the most cruel barbarism. He thoroughly exposed the "white-line" policy, as it is called. The details of this system of intolerance and coercion, gathered up from many sources, show that no conceivable device was left untried to crush out the element of negro suffrage. In Yazoo county alone where there were two thousand Republican voters, only seven of these votes were polled. This is a specimen of the outrages committed over the whole State.

EULOGIES.

On Thursday, February 24th, 1876, the memorial addresses, both in the Senate and the House, were delivered on the late Hon. Henry H. Starkweather, a member of the House from the State of Connecticut, who died at his residence in Washington, on the morning of January 28th, 1876, after a brief illness. The remarks on this occasion were deeply affecting. Mr. Starkweather himself had prepared an address to be delivered on the death of Senator Ferry, of his State, but his death occurred before the day set for the eulogies on Senator Ferry, and on that occasion the remarks which Mr. Starkweather had prepared were read to the House by General Garfield. Eulogies in memory of Mr. Starkweather were pronounced in the House by Messrs. Phelps, Hale, and Garfield; and in the Senate by Messrs. English, Dawes, Sargent, and Eaton, all of whom bore the highest testimony to his character as a man, a citizen, and a Christian.

SENATOR MORTON.

On Tuesday, February 29th, 1876, Senator Morton, of Indiana, rose in the hall of the Senate to a personal explanation, calling attention to a scandalous report in the *Baltimore Sun*, alleging a corrupt collusion between himself and others in some matters in the Territory of Utah. Senator Morton explained the circumstances, showing that the whole statement was a base unfounded slander. The scandalous recklessness of the detective press in accusing public men upon the slightest rumor started by some infamous and unprincipled scoundrel has reached a point in our country where forbearance has ceased to be a virtue. Cannot some legisla-

tion be devised to put a stop to such a flagitious use of the power of the press?

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS.

It is a lamentable truth that at this writing (March 15th, 1876,) not a single regular appropriation bill has become a law during the present session. The Naval Academy appropriation bill is still pending in the Senate. The fortification bill, which is cut down for the coming year to \$315,000, has only passed the House. The legislative bill, which proposes a reduction from \$18,000,000 to \$12,000,000, has just been ventilated in a few of its items in the Democratic branch of Congress. It appears as though it were the studied intention of the Democrats to cripple and derange all departments of the Government. It is difficult to perceive any wise or patriotic motive in the course pursued. The cry of retrenchment and reform is made a pretext for ignoring the very necessities of the civil service, and for producing a state of perfect impotency in the Government at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

THE RESUMPTION ACT.

Some attempts have been made to secure the repeal of the resumption act of the last Congress. Memorials from different bodies of citizens in various parts of the country have been submitted to Congress—particularly from the Boston Board of Trade and the New York Chamber of Commerce, both the latter opposing the repeal. On Monday, March 6, 1876, Senator Sherman, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, made an elaborate and exhaustive speech against the repeal. The points made in this speech are:

1. The resumption act is a solemn pledge of the nation.
2. Ought this promise be performed?
3. Can we perform it?
4. Are the agencies and measures prescribed in the law sufficient for the purpose?
5. If not, what additional measures should be enacted?

Under these heads he showed the nature of the pledge of the public faith; why public policy forbids its repeal; why a day should be fixed for the resumption of specie payments; the balance of trade, and the fal-

lacious deductions from it; the effect of contraction; resumption through national banks; effect upon existing debts; the drifting process; why no apparent results; the state of the national and fractional currency, and United States notes; the burden of resumption; powers conferred by the act of 1875; cost of silver coin and fractional currency, and auxiliary legislation. To this speech no effective answer has yet been made.

CURRENCY AND FINANCE.

In connection with the above subject several strong speeches have been delivered on the questions of currency and finance. On Monday, February 14, 1876, Mr. Hale introduced a preamble and resolution looking to immediate further legislation in favor of resumption, which was defeated by a vote of 139 to 85, 65 members not voting. On Saturday, February 26, 1876, Mr. Riddle delivered a long and carefully prepared speech in favor of the repeal of the resumption act. He was followed by Mr. Landers, on the same side, proposing what he styled the following remedies:

1. The unconditional repeal of the resumption act.
2. An act of Congress making coin and United States Treasury notes full or equal legal-tenders.
3. An act substituting par United States notes for the national bank currency.
4. An act making par greenbacks convertible at the pleasure of the holder into a certificate of deposit or bond bearing a low rate of interest.

But the Democratic majority of the House are hopelessly divided on the question, and there is no more prospect of substantial relief to the country from this quarter than from the veriest mass of chaos that ever was.

COLORADO.

On Monday, February 16, 1876, the House proceeded to the consideration of a bill amending the enabling act of the last House of Representatives in behalf of the Territory of Colorado, and the bill with some amendments was passed. On Monday, February 28, 1876, the Senate considered and passed the House bill for the admission of Colorado as a new State into the Union.

NEW MEXICO.

On Thursday, March 2, 1876, a bill for the admission of New Mexico into the Union was considered by the Senate. Subsequently the bill was recommitted, and again reported with amendments. On Friday, March 10, 1876, the bill was discussed at length, and with some further slight amendments was passed by a vote of 35 to 15, 23 not voting. The bill now goes to the House.

HAWAIIAN TREATY.

A strong opposition has been developed against legislation to carry out the objects of the confirmation of this treaty. On Wednesday, March 2, 1876, a majority report in favor of such legislation and a minority report opposing such legislation were both presented. The discussion has taken a wide range, and been very earnestly maintained by Messrs. Wood, Luttrell, Leavenworth, Kelley, and others in the House, but like most of the questions which have elicited debate in this Congress, it is still pending with no more prospect of conclusion.

SAFE BURGLARY AND WHISKY TRIALS.

The Democrats of the House have instituted still further investigation into these scandals, and thus added to a list which now numbers more than sixty different subjects of alleged fraud and corruption which they have already undertaken to lay open to the country.

PERSONAL ACCUSATIONS.

The attention of Congress has been directed to charges affecting the character of General Schenck, of General Babcock, and of Representatives Hays and Purman. It is the most prominent feature of the action of this Democratic House. The majority seem bent on ripping open every budget of scandal and vilification which is brought to their door, no matter in what shape or from what source it comes, and perhaps this is the safest course for them, as well as for the nation. The old maxim that "it is an ill wind which blows no good," is as true in this case as ever. We have learned from some counsel of poetic wisdom that "nothing is formed in vain," and we see but little use of the Democratic party unless it be to hunt the stench of such papers as the *New York Sun* and the *Chicago Times*.

PINCHBACK.

The case of ex-Governor Pinchback, claiming a seat as United States Senator from the State of Louisiana, after hanging in suspense for a period of three years, has been finally determined in the Senate. The question was upon a resolution offered by Senator Morton to the effect that Governor Pinchback be admitted to a seat as a Senator from Louisiana for the period of six years from March 4, 1873. To this an amendment was offered by Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, to the effect that Mr. T. B. S. Pinchback be *not* admitted to said seat. The discussion upon this subject was protracted and earnest. The whole case of the troubled condition of affairs in the unhappy State of Louisiana was gone over again and again. That Mr. Pinchback came to the Senate with the credentials of William P. Kellogg, the only acting Governor of that State, there is no question. It was first contended that on those credentials as *prima facie* evidence he was entitled to be sworn in and to take his seat, and that any investigation into the validity of his right should be taken afterwards. But this view of the case was overruled, and the papers referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It was upon the resolution reported from that committee, and the amendment proposed thereon that the discussion proceeded. On Wednesday, March 8, 1876, the case was finally disposed of by the adoption of Senator Edmunds' amendment, by a vote of 32 to 29—12 not voting. The resolution as amended was then adopted by the same vote, from which it appears that some five or six Republican Senators joined the entire body of Democrats in rejecting Mr. Pinchback. That they were constrained to this course by honest motives must not be questioned. Whatever difference there may be as to the views and purposes of the Democratic minority, no one will impute sinister designs to such men as Edmunds, Christiancy, Paddock, and the Morrills. As constitutional lawyers they could not divest themselves of the responsibility with their views of the law and the facts, although they clearly saw that the political considerations were all the other way. But, nevertheless, we must accord the

same high consideration to those who voted in the minority, believing them to be equally honest and, as we view the case, far more consistent in their course. And for ourselves we must express the regret that Mr. Pinchback was not admitted, since his right to the seat should have been confirmed just as much as Governor Kellogg's right has been confirmed to him.

BELKNAP.

But the great sensation for the past month has been produced in the case of General W. W. Belknap, late Secretary of War. Early in the session the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department entered upon an investigation into the administration of affairs in that Department. This committee consists of three Democrats, Messrs. Clymer, Blackburn, and Robbins; and two Republicans, Messrs. Bass and Danford. But the Democrats of the committee have been especially active in nosing about among the scandals of the detective press and the rumors floating in the air. They have been in contact and secret conclave with one and another who had anything to tell in disparagement of the conduct of affairs in the War Office, keeping the Republican members of the committee in profound ignorance of many of their movements. Thus they have been occupied for many weeks, until finally they stumbled upon a mine of corruption which has exploded the Secretary of War, General Belknap, out of office and rendered him liable to the process of the Constitution and the laws in such cases provided. This has been a big bonanza to the Democratic party throughout the country, and such a howl has gone up over the land from all the party and detective press as has not been heard before since the yells with which the rebels used to rush into battle during "the late little unpleasantness." It is, however, our duty to give the simple substance of the action in Congress in regard to this affair. On Wednesday, March 2d, 1876, Mr. Clymer, chairman of this committee, arrested the proceedings of the House by an unusual show of solemnity, and the announcement that he had a report to present of so much gravity that no delay should be made in unfolding it to the House and the country.

The report was then read, by himself, in the most lugubrious style, at the Clerk's desk, charging General Belknap with unparalleled crimes in office, upon the testimony of one Caleb P. Marsh, a rebel Kentucky Democrat, then residing in New York, and proposing resolutions for the impeachment of the Secretary. The story of this disgrace is too fresh to be repeated here. As soon as the matter was placed before the House some of the Republicans desired to consider it in order that the House might act with dignity and deliberation in the premises. But these efforts were of no avail, and under the operation of the previous question insisted upon by the Democrats, the matter was hurried through in a single hour, and the resolutions adopted by a unanimous vote. The Committee of Investigation were appointed to proceed immediately to the bar of the Senate and impeach W. W. Belknap, &c., &c. On Friday, March 3d, 1876, a message from the House was received by the Senate that a resolution of impeachment had been passed by the House, and that Messrs. Clymer, Blackburn, Robbins, Bass, and Danford were appointed a committee to appear in the case. At 1 o'clock the Sergeant-at-Arms announced the presence of the committee, who advanced to the area in front of the Chair, and Mr. Clymer, the chairman, delivered their message. The President *pro tempore* replied, "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee of the House of Representatives, the Senate will take order in the premises," whereupon the committee withdrew. Senator Edmunds offered the following, which was adopted:

Ordered, That the message of the House of Representatives relating to the impeachment of William W. Belknap be referred to a select committee consisting of five Senators.

The committee was named by the Chair, and consisted of Messrs. Edmunds, Conkling, Frelinghuysen, Thurman, and Stevenson.

On Monday, March 6th, 1876, Senator Edmunds reported the following from the select committee, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

"Whereas the House of Representatives on the 3d day of March, 1876, by five of its members, Messrs. Clymer, Robbins, Blackburn, Bass, and Danford, at the bar of the Senate, impeached William W. Belknap,

late Secretary of War, of high crimes and misdemeanors, and informed the Senate that the House of Representatives will in due time exhibit particular articles of impeachment against him and make good the same; and likewise demanded that the Senate take order for the appearance of the said William W. Belknap to answer the said impeachment: Therefore,

Ordered, That the Senate will, according to its standing rules and orders in such cases provided, take proper order thereon, (upon the presentation of articles of impeachment,) of which due notice shall be given to the House of Representatives.

Ordered, That the Secretary acquaint the House of Representatives herewith."

The next we hear of the matter in Congress is on Tuesday, March 7, 1876, in the House, when Mr. Clymer rises to a question of privilege. He states that he and his colleagues, Blackburn and Robbins, have been summoned to appear before the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with documents and papers to go before the Grand Jury, then in session, with a view to the indictment of General Belknap, and that having been let off by the court for the time being he comes to the House to raise the question of privilege. This led to a violent discussion upon the privileges of the House and the jurisdiction of the Court. The Democrats offered a resolution that the said committee and the members thereof are hereby directed to disregard the mandate of the Court until the further order of this House.

Mr. Hoar offered the following amendment or substitute:

"Resolved, That the said members be at liberty to attend before said court and give such evidence and produce such documents, if any they have, as relate to the charge against said Belknap for receiving a bribe from one Marsh."

A long and pointed debate ensued, which resulted in a defeat of the amendment by a vote of 130 to 84—75 not voting, and the adoption of the original resolution by a vote of 132 to 75—82 not voting. While these proceedings are in progress the Judiciary Committee of the House, to which is assigned the duty of preparing articles of impeachment, still holds back any report of its action. Marsh, the accusing witness, is allowed to flee out of the country, and the

Democrats are now occupied with efforts to obtain the passage of an act which will protect any rascal who will come forward as an informer upon those officials whom he has corrupted. Meanwhile the whole process against Belknap is at a standstill, both in the courts and in Congress, through the action of Mr. Clymer's committee, sustained by the Democratic majority of the House. Never was there a more disgraceful proceeding, take it altogether, than this which is now presented to the country. The main object of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives is too visible on the face of these transactions. After the first shock of the explosion of the scandal is over, the whole affair, as it has been managed by the bungling and unscrupulous partisans who have had it in charge, appears to have been a political trick to have an effect upon the eve of the New Hampshire election. It is most pitiable that such an officer as a Cabinet minister of whatever party should be shown to have been so complicated with the rascals around him, and it is scarcely less pitiable that the prosecution of the malefactor should be by some inscrutable arrangement of events committed to the hands of the leading representatives of the old rebel Bourbon Democracy in the present Congress. That all this is a foul blotch on the American name must be confessed with shame and humiliation by every honest and patriotic man.

BASE INGRATITUDE.—When a man betrays a trust he injures himself and wrongs the one whose confidence he has abused. President Grant had faith in Belknap. He saw in him qualities which he believed would make a good war minister. He had every reason to believe him to be a man of honor, and strong enough to resist temptation. He lifted him from obscurity, and honored him with one of the highest offices in the land. The full glare of prosperity was too much for the man thus honored. Instead of justifying the confidence of the President, he allowed his head to be turned by the desire to equal others in style and fashion. He lived beyond his legitimate income, and the same old story followed—betrayal of a sacred trust, exposure, and ruin.

REVIEW OF THE MONTH.

NATIONAL.

...It is difficult to tell which is the saddest aspect of the sad Belknap business. The fall of the ex-Secretary, involving as it does, if the act be proven, a breach of official and personal trust which is appalling; the base and degrading partisan use to which such a grave, personal dishonor has been perverted; or the infamous eagerness with which the *gobemouche* press have accepted every vile and distorted rumor, and by first *making* evidence, have succeeded in arraigning, convicting, and practically executing the delinquent official before the bar of public opinion long in advance of any possible trial by "his peers," or a "jury of his countrymen." The time-honored maxim—honored by that modern inquisition, the "sensation" press—"more honored in the breach than in the observance"—that a man is to be accounted innocent until he is *proven* guilty, has been utterly ignored in the case of William W. Belknap. THE REPUBLIC has no defense to make or plea to offer for the ex-Secretary of War, but it is bound, as all of all parties should be, to "nothing extenuate, nor ought set down in malice." Has this been the rule of press or partisans since this sad affair was made known? The crime with which Mr. Belknap is charged is a grave one; but it is in no sense political; it is only in a remote sense administrative; it is a breach of official trust—a malfeasance. As an act of personal wrong-doing it is one of a most disgraceful character, alike in its abuse of personal honor and grave trust, as in the petty extortion it produced on the rank and file of our small army. The first attitude of the House, majority and minority, was one of dignity, and the opinion of members as expressed on the day that Mr. Belknap was arraigned befitted the serious gravity of the circumstances. But this was only temporary. The election in New Hampshire was pending. Capital must be made. So unscrupulous was the effort that it reacted. The Star Chamber inquiry conducted by Messrs. Clymer, Blackburn, and Robbins—a violent Copperhead during the rebellion;

a Kentucky guerrilla, and an ex-Confederate soldier, and proven taker of petty bribes—has become a very boomerang, and instead of braining the President and defeating the Republican party, has recoiled on the heads of those who sent it. The records show the intent of the Democrats on that committee, for in no real and legal sense were the Republican members, Messrs. Bass and Danford, permitted to be parties to anything like a fair and impartial inquiry.

...The drag-net investigations now being conducted by the Democratic House have in no way been impeded by the minority therein, or hindered by the Executive Departments. Their partisan animus grows daily more apparent. They are in no case aimed at any direct abuse, but the several committees are merely privateers armed and provided with letters of marque, sailing free, and seeking what they may capture. It is worthy of note that so little has been developed. The secrecy of these inquiries justifies a belief in the accuracy of a suggestion that has been made, to the effect that the real purpose is to hold back the testimony until the Presidential campaign begins and then vomit forth *ex parte* accusations and statements. Another notable fact is this: that in nearly every case the most active men in the conduct of the investigations are those—new members—who either sought by arms to destroy the Union, or, at home in the North, living under its protection, did all they could to hinder and injure the progress and triumph of the Union cause. Another fact that will bear examination is the cost of these inquiries. What is to be saved at the spigot of reduced salaries is already running to waste at the bung-hole of costly reporting, enormous printing, and useless (to a large extent) witnesses.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE ELECTION.

...The result of the election on Tuesday, the 14th ultimo, in New Hampshire, has not been a surprise to those who coolly watch the signs of the times. The folly of the Democracy in general, and of the South in particular, leads them to discredit the strength

and earnestness of the convictions which sway the loyal millions. Busy with many things, and full of the cares and interests attaching to a high and complex civilization, they do not, as a whole, or as a rule, devote themselves to political activities with the same zest that animates the Southern and Democratic partisans. The Republican party can never be made a compact follow-my-leader organization like the Democracy. Hence its members are strongly inclined to teach lessons to those in power. It is the exercise of this inclination, sometimes wise, often otherwise, that leads the Democracy to cherish the vain delusion that the party of nationality and liberty is about to break to pieces. This is what they have been believing for a year or two past. The effect of their folly has been seen in the vain glory of the Confederate Democrats, and in the speeches of Hill, Tucker, Blackburn, *et al.* *The loyal citizens of this country will never surrender the Government of the Union into the control of the men and party that sought to destroy it.* Whenever there is a reasonable fear of such a result they will assert their will in unmistakable terms. They are able to punish all offenders against honest administration in their own ranks. They will do it, too. But they never will permit the indignation aroused in that way to lead them into the criminal folly of surrendering the country into the hands of those who would destroy it. This was the issue in New Hampshire. This is to be the issue in Connecticut, in August next in North Carolina and Alabama, in California next September, and in Ohio and Iowa next October, and through the whole thirty-eight States (Colorado will then be in the sisterhood) next November. There can be little fears of the result. The ghastly memories of Andersonville forbid but one end. The threats and boasts made by the sectional and Democratic South insure its defeat. In the Belknap business, also, as in other things, the engineers "are hoist with their own petards."

...The past Republican vote of the Granite State is worth reproduction and comparison. The State was first carried in 1856, and has been, with three exceptions, uniformly Republican ever since. On a vote ranging

from 71,556 in 1856 (the Presidential election) to 80,206 in 1875, the Republican majorities have gone from 9,115 in 1860, down to a plurality of but 172 in 1875. The Democratic party carried the Granite State (since 1856) in 1863, in 1871, and again in 1874. This was on the vote for Governor. The vote stood as follows:

		Dem.	Rep.	Maj.
1863	Governor.....	32,833	29,085	*3,798
1871	Governor.....	34,699	33,892	*807
1874	Governor.....	35,608	34,143	*1,465

*Plurality and over next highest candidate. In 1863 the Union candidate received 4,372 votes; in 1871 the Liberal Republican got 782 and the Temperance candidate 836; and in 1874 the Temperance candidate received 2,100 votes.

In each of these years examination shows that Democratic victory has not resulted from an increase in their vote, but from abstention on the part of Republicans, and by separate action on the part of those individualized movements or clans which more naturally gravitate to our standard whenever there is an overwhelming emergency. In 1862 and 1864, for instance, the Republican vote was 3,115, and 7,971 more than in 1863, while the Democratic increase was but small. In 1870 and 1872 the Republican vote exceeded that of 1871 by 1,020 and 4,860. The highest Democratic vote since 1856 was last year—a total of 39,121. The highest Republican vote was in 1868, for Governor, 39,785. Its lowest was in 1863. The smallest Democratic vote cast was in 1870 for Governor, 25,023. The Presidential votes since 1856 are as follows:

	Dem.	Rep.	Am.	Maj.
1856.....	32,789	38,345	422 Bell.	5,143 R.
1860.....	27,993	37,519	411	9,115 "
1864.....	32,340	34,332	2,192 "
1868.....	31,224	39,191	6,967 "
1872.....	31,425	37,168	5,443 "

In 1872 O'Conner received 100 votes and the Temperance candidate 200.

It is noteworthy that the vote for Governor in the spring preceeding the Presidential election is, as a rule, larger than that cast for the national tickets. The only exception in the years named was in 1856. This is the general rule in all States where State elections precede in the same year that for the Electoral College.

OTHER REPUBLICAN GAINS—LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

...The large majority of the town, county, and city elections which have taken place this year have resulted in very considerable Republican gains.

On the 6th of March a number of elections were had in Iowa, Illinois, and Michigan. In nearly every instance the Republican candidates were elected. Des Moines, Iowa, for instance, was carried, reversing last year's vote. In the Eastern States, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and New York, the victories are very decided. Portland, Maine, was carried for a Republican mayor by 516 votes, the first time for several years. Bangor elected a Republican mayor by 325 majority; the Democratic candidate last year had 164 plurality. At Biddeford the Republicans gained largely. At Augusta they carried the city and every ward, electing the mayor by 350. At Belfast they had 8 majority on the mayor, and carried the two boards. In New York the gains are as noticeable. Rochester was carried for the Republicans by 2,504 majority, a gain of 2,021. Up to this writing large gains have been made in the elections for county supervisors. In the town meetings for the first week in March there were 24 more Republican supervisors elected than was the case last year. At the second week's meeting, there were 62 more chosen. The total Republican gains were 88; the Democrats, however, gained 11, and the net Republican gain was, therefore, 77.

STATE CONVENTIONS.

...A State Republican Convention was held in Indianapolis on the 22d of February. The State ticket nominated consists of the following persons: Governor, G. S. Orth; Lieutenant Governor, R. S. Robertson; for Judges, W. P. Edson, A. C. Vorhis, H. C. Newcomb, and J. F. Kibbey; Secretary of State, J. P. Watts; Auditor, Wm. M. Hess; Treasurer,

G. F. Herriott; Attorney General, J. W. Gordon; Reporter and Clerk of Supreme Court, L. D. Miller and C. G. Schall; Superintendent of Public Instruction, Professor O. H. Smith.

After recounting the record of the party, resolutions adopted declare: 1. That the Republicans of Indiana will remain faithful to the National Republican party. 2. Will not recognize the right of any State to interfere in the execution of national laws. 3. Holds the Government of the United States a nation, not a mere confederation of States. 4. National and State governments independent within their own spheres. 5. Willing and anxious to restore relations between the North and South; not willing to forgive the unrepentant, and not willing to place those who fought against the Union on equality with those who fought for it. 6. Preference to Union soldiers for office as against amnestied Confederates. 7. Believes the conduct of the civil service should recognize qualifications and integrity, not party service. 8. All men equal. 9. Insists upon religious freedom and entire separation of church and State. 10. The revenue system should be so regulated as to promote harmony between labor and capital. 11. Taxes should be heaviest on luxuries. 12. Repeal of the specie resumption act. 13. Maintenance of the present system of currency. 14. Applauds the financial policy of the Republican party. 15. Opposes payment of the Confederate debt or Confederate losses. 16. Demands economy in the administration of the State and national governments. 17. Demands faithful administration of the school laws. 18. No laws in opposition to the wish of the majority. 19. Insists on bounties and pensions for soldiers of the rebellion. 20. Approves Grant's administration. 21. Presents Senator Morton for the Republican nomination.

...The Indiana Democratic Convention has been called for the 19th of April. The following call has been issued:

1. Correct constitutional principles in the administration of public affairs, be they either national, State, or local. 2. The most frugal and rigid economy in all departments of Government. 3. The punishment of crimes and criminals of high or low degree; the impartial enforcement of the law upon all, with

favor to none. 4. The protection of the labor and industrial interests of the country from the encroachments of monopolies of any and all characters. 5. The largest liberty to the individual citizen consistent with a just and vigorous administration of the laws. 6. A currency sufficient to meet the demands of trade, and which shall be alike receivable by all classes of people. 7. Equal taxation of property with just discrimination. 8. The repeal of the resumption act passed by a Republican Congress, in order that the business and commercial interests may recover their vigor and a new stimulus be given the industries and enterprise of the country. 9. The freedom of conscience in all matters of religion. No connection between church and State. 10. The punishment of malfeasance and corruption in office, without partiality or favor. 11. The nomination of none but honest and competent men for office. 12. The maintenance of our present admirable public school system, the outgrowth of the Democratic party's foresight and wisdom.

...The Wisconsin Republicans at their State Convention elected the following delegates at large to Cincinnati: Philletus Sawyer, David Atwood, Mark Douglass, and James H. Howe. The resolutions adopted promise to promote friendly feeling and harmony throughout the country; to support measures to secure the constitutional rights of all persons, including the exercise of the franchise, without intimidation or fraud. They approve of the vigorous efforts to punish official dishonesty and frauds on the revenue; declare it unwise for the Chief Magistrate to hold office beyond two terms, and accept President Grant's declaration in harmony with this principle as another claim to our veneration and gratitude; oppose impairing the credit of the nation by depreciating any of its obligations; declare that the currency of the country should, as soon as consistent with business interests and safety, be made equal to gold, and until that time should continue as a legal tender; hold that the common schools should be maintained absolutely free from sectarian contact, and finally declare that in celebrating the Centennial of this Republic it should be remembered that we are indebted not only to its founders, but to its defenders. The Congressional districts reported their delegates and electors and their action was ratified.

Mr. Blaine's name was heartily indorsed

for the Presidential nomination, though no instructions were given.

...The Prohibitionists in Rhode Island have put in nomination for Governor, Albert C. Howard; Lieutenant Governor, Alfred B. Chadsey; Secretary of State, Joshua M. Ad-deman; Attorney General, Warren R. Pierce; General Treasurer, A. D. Vose.

...The Connecticut Republicans in convention have placed the following ticket before the people: For Governor, H. C. Robinson; Lieutenant Governor, F. J. Kingsbury; Secretary of State, F. A. Walker; Treasurer, Jeremiah Olney; Comptroller, Eli Curtis.

Its platform expressed fidelity to the party, denounced sectional rule, indorsed the administration, denounced corruption, and urged the punishment of offenders. On financial matters the platform states that "the greenbacks were issued under the pressure of a temporary necessity to support the National Government against treason and rebellion, and that the party is pledged to redeem them and make them as good as gold to the holder, that no stain may rest in history upon any one of the patriotic efforts of the loyal people during the war."

Further, that "the welfare of the country demands that necessary legislation be passed to carry the resumption act into effect at the time specified, either by funding the greenbacks in long bonds at the lowest practicable interest, or by using any available means to pay and cancel them."

...The Democratic nominations are as follows: For Governor, Charles R. Ingersoll; Lieutenant Governor, George G. Hill; Secretary of State, Marvin H. Sanger; Treasurer, William E. Raymond; Comptroller, Albert R. Goodrich.

The platform denounces military usurpation, a corrupt civil service, eulogizes the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives for reducing expenditures, &c., declares that public credit must be maintained, demands that public lands should be preserved for the settlers, denounces the resumption act as a Republican sham, and urges Congress to substitute for it a well-defined and practical legislation tending to an accumulation of coin as a basis for resumption or funding and cancellation of

a portion of the greenback circulation in a convertible bond bearing a low rate of interest. The sixth resolution set forth the doctrine of specie basis, but quibbles in the following way: "It is therefore the duty of Congress to adopt such measures as shall lead to an early resumption of specie payments, while guarding its acts by that prudence which the interests of commercial, manufacturing, and industrial pursuits imperatively demand."

A fourth ticket, the third being that of the temperance party, has been nominated by a greenback convention held at Meriden. The platform adopted demands the repeal of the resumption act, and advocates a system by which currency would automatically regulate and limit itself. This is to be accomplished by the familiar plan of retiring national bank notes and making the currency exclusively a national issue, interconvertible at par with coin in bonds bearing low interest, the currency only to be issued when paid for, and neither Congress nor banks having any control over the amount issued.

The following ticket was nominated: Governor, Charles Atwater; Lieutenant Governor, Francis Gillette; Secretary of State, Lucien V. Pinney; Treasurer, Loren F. Judd; Comptroller, John A. Peck.

...The Ohio Prohibitionists in convention, at Columbus, February 22, nominated the following state ticket: Secretary of State, E. S. Chapman; Judge of the Supreme Court, D. W. Gage; Member of the Board of Public Works, Ferdinand Schumacher; Controller, J. C. Murdock; School Commissioner, George K. Jenkins. About one hundred delegates were present, and resolutions usual to such bodies were adopted.

...An interesting convention was held at New Orleans on the 1st of March, and following days, to consider what should be done to promote immigration to the South and West. Delegates were present from Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kansas, and Florida. The subjects considered were the best means of promoting immigration to the States of the Mississippi valley; the establishment at the port of New Orleans of an immigration bureau and depot in the interests of the States included in the call; the superior economy of the Mississippi river route for the immigrant to the interior States; the legislation needed by the different States in aid of the enterprise.

EXECUTIVE AND DEPARTMENT DOINGS.

THE EXECUTIVE.

THE REORGANIZATION AT THE WHITE HOUSE.

The position of officials at the White House may be authoritatively stated as follows: General Babcock, who never drew salary as a secretary, but drew it as an engineer officer, returns to duty, and Colonel Fred. Grant is assigned to his place. General Babcock's retirement did not create a vacancy, nor does Colonel Grant's selection create a new position. Both draw army pay. Levi P. Luckey held the office known to law as private secretary to the President. He takes A. S. H. White's place at the Interior Department, and Ulysses Grant, Jr., takes Mr. Luckey's place. Mr. C. C. Sniffin holds the same position he has always held, as assistant private secretary.

STATE DEPARTMENT.

PORTUGAL AT THE CENTENNIAL.

Information has been received from a reliable quarter that the sum of \$23,000 has been requested by the Portuguese Government in the Cortes for the purpose of rendering the Portuguese exhibition as attractive and complete as possible. This sum is intended for two sections in particular, namely, the agricultural and the industrial, which two sections appear to have attracted the greater part of the attention of Portugal. According to a telegraphic dispatch the goods are nearly ready to be embarked on board a steam transport to be conveyed to Philadelphia. A pavilion is to be erected on the Exhibition grounds to serve as a bureau for the Portuguese commission. The display of

wines, from present indications, will undoubtedly deserve the particular attention of those concerned in the wine trade.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

THE PUBLIC DEBT—MONTHLY STATEMENT.

The recapitulation of the statement of the public debt of the United States for the month of February, 1876, just issued, is as follows:

Debt bearing interest in coin:	
Bonds at 6 per cent.....	\$984,969,650 00
Bonds at 5 per cent.....	697,884,750 00
	<u>\$1,682,854,400 00</u>

Debt bearing interest in lawful money:	
Navy pension fund at 3 per cent.....	\$14,000,000 00

Debt on which interest has ceased since maturity.....	\$18,182,080 26
---	-----------------

Debt bearing no interest:	
Old demand and legal-tender notes.....	\$371,011,844 50
Certificates of deposit.....	38,045,000 00
Fractional currency.....	45,120,132 47
Coin certificates.....	32,915,000 00
	<u>\$487,091,976 97</u>

Total debt.....	\$2,202,158,457 22
-----------------	--------------------

Interest.....	\$30,412,026 47
---------------	-----------------

Total debt, principal and interest.....	\$2,232,570,483 70
---	--------------------

Cash in Treasury:	
Coin.....	\$70,035,772 73
Currency.....	9,529,404 17
Special deposit held for redemption of certificates of deposit as provided by law.....	38,045,000 00
	<u>\$117,610,176 90</u>

Debt, less cash in the Treasury March 1, 1876.....	\$2,114,960,306 80
--	--------------------

Debt, less cash in the Treasury February 1, 1876.....	2,118,233,039 80
---	------------------

Decrease of debt during the past month.....	\$3,272,733 00
---	----------------

Decrease of debt since June 30, 1875.....	\$13,728,419 52
---	-----------------

Bonds issued to the Pacific railway companies, interest payable in lawful money—Principal outstanding, \$64,623,512; interest accrued and not yet paid, \$646,235.12; interest paid by the United States, \$30,141,513.06; interest repaid by transportation of mails, &c., \$6,724,317.92; balance of interest paid by the United States, \$23,417,193.14.

CASH IN THE TREASURY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8, 1876.

SIR: In reply to the resolution of the House of Representatives of January 31, 1876, requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish a detailed statement showing the amount of actual cash on hand in the

Treasury, several depositories, and mints of the United States at the close of business on the 25th day of January, 1876, I have the honor to inform you that there were held at that time at the offices mentioned cash assets as follows:

Minor coins.....	\$74,769 17
Fractional currency.....	8,755,653 44
National bank notes.....	5,123,730 41

Legal tender notes held on special deposit for the payment of—

1. Certificates of deposit issued under sections 5193 and 5194 Revised Statutes United States.....	\$38,145,000 00
2. Redemption notes of national banks failed.....	907,756 95
3. Redemption notes of national banks in liquidation.....	4,913,001 80
4. Redemption notes of national banks for reducing circulation.....	15,784,998 00

Other legal-tender notes.....	59,750,756 75
Gold coin.....	17,608,684 26
Gold bullion.....	44,650,128 24
Silver coin.....	10,254,409 59
Silver bullion.....	11,202,258 60
Gold notes and certificates.....	4,146,332 67
Coupons.....	8,787,761 00
Called bonds and interest thereon.....	7,007,325 56
Checks, funded loan of 1881.....	11,311,695 65
Registered interest.....	63,543 83
Exchange drafts.....	582,508 50
One and two years' notes.....	350,500 00
Redeemed certificates.....	5,837 33
Vouchers—Speaker's certificates.....	70,000 00
Metal-fund in mint, (currency).....	156,475 01
Unavailable, (see Finance Report, 1875, page 404.)	50,000 00
New Orleans.....	\$680,801 53
New York.....	87,206 70
Philadelphia.....	882 50
Washington, D. C.....	47,097 65
	<u>816,078 38</u>

In all.....	190,778,043 24
-------------	----------------

This amount does not include any money in transit, nor is the amount of Treasury drafts outstanding at that time taken into consideration.

In addition to this amount there was also an amount of public moneys in national bank depositories; but as returns thereof are made at the close of each week, the amount of such moneys at the time mentioned in the resolution can be stated only by delaying this reply for a special report from all the depository banks of the public moneys on hand at that time.

At the close of business on the 22d ultimo, three days prior to the time mentioned in the resolution, the bank depositories held of such moneys \$10,140,611.61, which information it is thought will answer the purpose of the resolution.

As the legal-tender notes received for the redemption of national-bank notes do not belong to the United States, of course their amount is not in any way embraced in the

monthly debt statement of this Department.

Very respectfully,

B. H. BRISTOW,

Hon. M. C. KERR, Secretary.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PAPER MONEY ISSUED AND OUTSTANDING JANUARY 1, 1876.

Fractional currency.....	\$44,147,079
Old demand notes.....	69,642
Legal-tender notes.....	371,827,220
National bank notes.....	346,479,756

Total..... 762,523,690

Less cash in the Treasury January 25, 1876—

Legal tender notes..... \$77,359,441

Of which there was held for U. S. certificates of deposit in the national banks December 17, 1875.....

31,005,000

Fractional currency..... 46,354,441

National bank notes..... 8,755,635

Less cash in national banks December 17, 1875—

Legal tender notes..... \$70,725,077

Fractional currency..... 2,901,023

U. S. certificates of deposit..... 31,005,000

National bank notes..... 17,166,190—121,797,290

Less cash in other banks—

State banks..... \$26,740,215

Savings banks..... 17,538,182

Trusts companies..... 3,833,012— 48,431,409

Total amount to be deducted for cash in the Treasury and in banks..... \$230,462,525

Leaving amount of paper currency in circulation..... \$532,061,165

BONDS HELD TO SECURE NATIONAL BANK CIRCULATION.

The Treasury now holds \$356,295,750 in bonds to secure national bank circulation, and \$18,721,500 to secure public deposits; United States bonds deposited for circulation for the week ending Saturday, March 4, was \$79,000; United States bonds held for circulation withdrawn for the week ending Saturday, March 4, was \$781,900, making a decrease in the outstanding circulation of over \$700,000; national bank circulation outstanding, \$340,415,456, of which amount \$2,099,190 are gold notes; internal revenue received Saturday, \$418,162.44; month to date, \$1,278,788.39; fiscal year to date, \$76,548,176.46; customs Saturday, \$118,012.79; month to date, \$1,796,801.76; fiscal year to date, \$101,608,481.89.

BANK REPORTS CALLED FOR.

The Comptroller of the Currency has called upon the national banks for reports showing their condition at the close of business on Friday, the 10th day of March. The Comptroller has also declared a dividend of 10 per cent. in favor of the Charlottesville (Virginia) National Bank and 30 per cent. in favor of the creditors of Gibson County National Bank, Princeton, Indiana, dividends payable as soon as the necessary schedules are prepared.

EXPORTS OF PROVISIONS FOR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY.

The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics furnishes a statement of the exports of provisions for the month of February, from which it appears the total exports from Baltimore were \$289,000; Boston, \$1,248,982; Philadelphia, \$1,025,930; New York, \$5,241,000, and New Orleans, \$43,073.

TRADE WITH THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

The following statement of the trade between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands during the calendar year 1875 is furnished by the chief of the Bureau of Statistics. Imports free of duty, \$163,747; dutiable, \$1,224,503; total, \$1,388,250. Among the principal dutiable articles were the following: Sugar—pounds, 21,609,556; \$1,113,237. Rice—pounds, 1,768,852; \$66,365. Raw wool—pounds, 109,359; \$11,861. Value of domestic exports, \$739,606; foreign, \$43,955; total, 783,561.

GENERAL POST OFFICE.

MONEY ORDERS TO CANADA.

An arrangement has been made by the Post Office Department with the Dominion Government by which the system recently inaugurated for the exchange of money orders between the United States and Canada is extended to Newfoundland.

WHEN A Republican is tried before a St. Louis jury and found "not guilty," it is about time that the Democratic press of the country take back some of the malignant expressions which tended to prejudice the case. If General Babcock had been found guilty the opponents of the administration would have devoted columns to the justice of the verdict. How many will have the manhood to devote a single paragraph to the justice of his acquittal?